UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

NARRATIVE AUTHORITY IN (TEACHER) EDUCATION

BY

MARGARET RUTH OLSON

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1993

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-88091-0

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: Margaret Ruth Olson

TITLE OF THESIS: Narrative Authority in (Teacher) Education

DEGREE: Doctor of Philosophy

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1993

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as hereinbefore provided neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

address 1429 Clearview Drive #203

Peterborough, Ontario

K9K 1X8

DATE September 27, 1993

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled NARRATIVE AUTHORITY IN (TEACHER) EDUCATION submitted by MARGARET RUTH OLSON in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY in TEACHER EDUCATION.

Dr. D. Jean Clandinin (supervisor)
Associate Professor of Elementary Education

Dr. Myer Horowitz
Professor of Education

Dr. Robert K. Jackson
Professor and Chair of Elementary Education

Dr. Margaret Iveson
Associate Professor of Secondary Education

Dr. Gordon McIntosh
Professor of Educational Administration

Dr. Ardra Cole
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

DATE September 24, 1993

This work is dedicated to the memory of

GLWYN OLSON

September 8, 1953 - May 15, 1993

The little brother whose love of life, children, family and community enriched the lives of all who knew him. His life lived in caring relationship with others made him the heart of the family. The memories he left provide stories to value and learn from.

Abstract

In this narrative inquiry I explore how Zach and Susan, two preservice teacher education students, construct and reconstruct their knowledge of good teaching from their experiences during the professional year of their teacher education programs. I use Dewey's (1938) notion of experience as continuous and interactive to explore how students' personal practical knowledge (Clandinin, 1986) constructed and reconstructed through past and present experience interacts with both university and practica teacher education situations to form and reform their knowledge of good teaching.

I describe different conceptions of teacher education as "getting an education" and "becoming more experienced" implicit within Bruner's (1986) paradigmatic and narrative constructions of knowledge. I link these conceptions of teacher education to the authority of reason and the authority of experience. I argue that we author our lives as good teachers based on our narrative knowledge of good teaching expressed in our personal practical knowledge. I focus on tensions between paradigmatic and narrative knowledge which emerge for Zach and Susan as they try to author their lives to become good teachers.

I present narrative accounts of Zach's and Susan's experiences. I then present two research stories, "Fitting In" and "Surviving the System," to illustrate how differently Zach and Susan use their personal practical knowledge to construct and reconstruct stories of good teaching. I show the curriculum of teacher education, while appearing to be the presentation of professional knowledge, is instead a complex interplay between the personal practical knowledge of university teachers, school teachers, and teacher education students. I also show this narrative knowledge is primarily ignored and left implicit within Zach's and Susan's teacher education programs.

I illuminate sources of tension for Zach and Susan among the technical rational, apprenticeship, and inquiry models of teacher education embedded in their personal practical knowledge and in their teacher education programs. I describe how the dominant teacher education story of "getting an education" embedded in technical rationalism and apprenticeship adheres to a plot line of reflective practice which is the antithesis of the reflective inquiry story of "becoming more experienced" through reflective narrative inquiry.

Acknowledgements

I would first like to thank Zach and Susan who, by openly sharing their experiences with me and taking time to respond to my interpretations of their experiences, have made this research possible.

I also express my sincere appreciation to Dr. D. Jean Clandinin, my supervisor and friend, for her infinite time and patience in helping me figure out what I was trying to say. Her thoughtful responses helped me articulate my implicit understandings and led me to new insights. Her support and encouragement have been invaluable.

Dr. Robert Jackson and Dr. Myer Horowitz, my committee members, have shared their time and provided support whenever I needed it. Their insightful comments and probing questions have helped me develop better understandings of the process of teacher education and of myself as a researcher. Thank you for being there. In particular, I wish to thank Dr. Myer Horowitz for encouraging me to pursue doctoral studies and for providing me with continual support and encouragement at both the master and doctoral levels of my studies.

To my examining committee members, Dr. Margaret Iveson and Dr. Gordon McIntosh, thank you both for your thought provoking comments and questions.

I also thank Dr. Ardra Cole, my external committee member, for her careful reading of this work, her thoughtful response, and her insightful questions.

Comments, questions, encouragement and support have also been part of the story lived by graduate students in the Centre for Research for Teacher Education and Development of which I have been fortunate to be a part. I extend my appreciation to Sherilyn Grywul, research secretary in the Centre for her daily support and encouragement. I also thank Janice Huber, Nophanet Dhamborvorn, and Cheryl Craig for their careful readings and thoughtful responses to various drafts of my work. Others in the Centre including Hedy Bach, Haya Lachman, Ian Sewall, Elaine McKeil, Brian Stelk, Kathy Webb, and Debbie Schroeder have also provided continuous support and encouragement.

I also wish to acknowledge the financial support received from the University of Alberta and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

Finally, I wish to thank my husband, Lester, for his unwavering support and encouragement through this difficult journey, as well as my son, Scott, and daughter, Shannon, for their patience and understanding as I followed my dream. It has been difficult, but I encourage my family, and others, to do the same.

CONSTRUCTION OF THE INQUIRY

I A REFLECTIVE RETURN: BEGINNING THE INQUIRY 1
A Reflective Return 2
Shaping the Inquiry 9

II CONNECTIONS WITH THE LITERATURE 10
Situating the Inquiry 10
Knowledge Constructed from Experience 14
Experience as Continuous and Interactive 14
The Centrality of Voice in Representing Experience 15
Two Modes of Constructing Knowledge 16
The Paradigmatic Mode: Decontextualized Knowledge 17
The Narrative Mode: Contextualized Knowledge 18
The Relationship of the Knower to the Known 19
The Authority of Reason: A Position of Status 20
The Authority of Experience: Persons in Relation 20
The Narrative Qualities of Experience 21
Temporal Continuity 21
Intersubjective Connections 22
Authoring a Life 24
Narratives as Moral Authority 25
Educative Qualities of Experience 26
Conversation 28
Cover Stories 31
Contexts of Teacher Education 32
Contexts of the Inquiry 35

III METHODOLOGY 37
Narrative Inquiry 37
The Inquiry Unfolds 39
Beginning the Inquiry: Developing Relationships 39
Coming to Know Zach and Susan 40
Inviting Zach and Susan to Participate 41
Negotiation and Ethical Considerations 42
Representing the Experience as Text 43

Choosing Conversation 44
The Research Conversations 45
Collaborative Stories 47
Multiple Levels of Interpretation 48
Stories as Field Texts of Experience 49
From Oral Field Texts to Written Field Texts 49
From Field Text to Interpretive Field Text 50
From Interpretive Field Text to Research Text 51
Research Text as Readerly Text 53

IV ZACH'S STORY 54
Learning the Choices 55
Finding the Balance 57
Book I: Voices of Authority 58
Prelude (May to August, 1991) 58
Chapter One (September to mid-November, 1991) 63
Chapter Two (mid-November to mid-December, 1991) 69
Interlude (January, 1992) 75
Finale (February to April, 1992) 78
Book II: Making it Happen 83
Prelude (May to August, 1991) 83
Chapter One (September to mid-November, 1991) 85
Chapter Two (mid-November to mid-December, 1991) 90
Interlude (January, 1992) 101
Finale (February to April, 1992) 106

V SUSAN'S STORY 118
Tied in Knots (September to December, 1991) 121
Voice Training: Encounter Points with Authorship 121
Episode #1: The Interview: Whose Agenda is This? 122
Episode #2: Making Choices 126
Episode #3: Planning with Lists and Webs 127
Relationships as Encounter Points 130
Episode #1: The Alien 130
Episode #2: Connecting With People (Working Together) ... 132
Episode #3: Group Work 134

Encountering Different Ways of Knowing 137
Dilemma #1: Questions and Answers 137
Dilemma #2: Becoming a Trained Professional 139
Dilemma #3: Putting Theory into Practice 142
Dilemma #4: Relevance and Imposition 144
Dilemma #5: Isn't it All the Same Thing? 146
Tying and Untying (January to April, 1992) 147
Struggling with Voice 147
Episode #1: The Panel 147
Episode #2: We're Not on the Same Level 150
Episode #3: Dinner with Friends 151
Relating to Others 152
Episode #1: Interacting with People 153
Episode #2: Visiting the Behavior Assistance Class 155
Shifts in Knowing 158
Episode #1: Art Lessons 159
Episode #2: Knowing What to Expect 161
Episode #3: Putting Theory into Practice 164
Episode #4: Learning to Think 165
Episode #5: I'm Learning! 167
Off and Running (September to December, 1992) 169
Authoring: Who Will be Listened to? 170
Episode #1: Caught in the Middle of Multiple Stories 170
Episode #2: Parent Meeting 174
Relationships 176
Episode #1: Seeing Individual Students 176
Episode #2: Christmas Concert 180
Knowing as Thinking on My Feet 182
Episode #1: Reflecting on Practice 182

VI AUTHORIZING STORIES OF GOOD TEACHING 186
Constructing Knowledge as Paths and Webs 189
Zach: The Curriculum Path 189
Susan: A Web of Relationships 191
The Authority of Knowledge 192
Zach: Building Up a Body of Knowledge 192

Susan: Gaining a Variety of Perspectives 193
Authoring Relationships with Others 194
Zach: Respecting the Authority of Position 194
Susan: Respecting the Authority of Experience 194
Choosing to Author Stories of Good Teaching 195
Zach: Fitting In 196
Prelude: Fitting into the Situation 196
Chapter One: Reading the Situation 198
Chapter Two: Making it Happen 201
Interlude: Choosing a Direction 206
Finale: Understanding the Situation 208
Susan: Surviving the System 212
Tied in Knots: Lost in the System 213
Tying and Untying: Caught in the System 219
Off and Running: Surviving the System 223
Conclusion 227

VII A REFLECTIVE RETURN: CONTINUING THE INQUIRY 229
Narrative Authority in Teacher Education 229
The Authority of Sacred Stories in Teacher Education 232
Integrating Narrative and Paradigmatic Knowledge 238
Educative Experience as Choosing to Stay Awake 241
Restorying Teacher Education 243
Paying Attention to the Authority of Sacred Stories 243
Narrative Authority as Personal and Professional Integrity 245
Educative Experience as Choosing to Stay Awake 249
Reflections on Narrative Inquiry as a Research Methodology 251
New Research Wonders 252

REFERENCES 256

APPENDIX A: Dates of Research Conversations with Zach 261
APPENDIX B: Dates of Research Conversations with Susan 262
APPENDIX C: Excerpt from Interpretive Field Text (Zach) 263
APPENDIX D: Excerpt from Interpretive Field Text (Susan) 267

CHAPTER ONE

We shall not cease from exploration
And the end of all our exploring
Will be to arrive where we started
And know the place for the first time.

T. S. Eliot

A REFLECTIVE RETURN: BEGINNING THE INQUIRY

When I returned to university as a graduate student after teaching for 19 years, I began my first day the same way I had begun my days as an undergraduate student -- or so I thought at the time. My intentions for returning to university had not included meeting with undergraduate education students.

I vividly remember arriving on my first day as a graduate student and sitting down by myself to enjoy a cup of coffee before starting my day. This was my new job for the year and I planned on being "at work" from 8 to 5 as usual. While sitting in the lounge of the Education Building, thinking how wonderful it was to be away from the hourly crises and time pressures of teaching, I began to realize that, although I planned to put in full days, the ways in which I filled those days would be almost completely up to me. I could have a second cup of coffee. Or a third. I was not on supervision. No bell would ring. My time was my own. I had a class from 10:00 a.m. to noon, but the rest of the day I could read or write, or just talk with people. I could go where I wanted when I wanted. I sat sipping my coffee, taking in this new sense of freedom. At the table beside me were some fourth year teacher education students discussing how they could hardly wait to get out of this place and into the "real world" of teaching. What different responses we were having to the "same" environment! We seemed to be experiencing two different worlds, their story echoing my story of twenty years ago. Hearing that conversation was the beginning of my growing fascination with the lives of teacher education students.

Although I had come to university to pursue my own interests and not become involved in other people's lives, I soon discovered that their lives <u>were</u> my interest. The more I talked with these students, and listened to their conversations, the more intrigued I became by the ways in which their stories reflected my own stories of preservice teacher education. Now, as I reflect on my research, I find the stories of their experiences in teacher education have mingled with mine, leading to my fascination with the ways in which we come to understandings of teaching and teacher education.

A Reflective Return

As I listened to students puzzle over the task of fitting required courses into prescheduled time slots, I made connections with my own story. As an undergraduate teacher education student I did not have much choice in the courses I took. I trusted others to know what courses were best for me and I believed my professors held the knowledge I needed. In order to become a successful teacher I only needed to find out what they wanted me to do and then do it. While I knew there were certain things I needed to know in order to become a teacher, I did not know what those things were, so it made sense to listen to others. I had confidence in my ability to learn what I was taught. I was sure that if I listened carefully, did what I was told, and worked hard, I would learn how to teach -- after all, I was going to university to receive an education.

During that first Registration Day I was able to fit the required courses into a cohesive timetable. Getting each course section approved validated my sense of ability to plan and let me know I belonged and was accepted. I had permission to begin. Everything that needed to be accomplished had been done and I was on my way. However, that initial sense of accomplishment was seldom felt again. My actual experience was not nearly so cohesive as it had looked on paper. Throughout my program I felt little sense of connection between my personal sense of knowing, the knowledge I received, and my future career as a teacher. The knowledge I had constructed from personal experience seemed out of place in the official curriculum. I wonder now what kinds of connections present students construct from their experience.

One of the biggest problems I experienced was that most of the official knowledge I was supposed to receive stayed on paper. It was objective, sanitized, and rigidly packaged into various courses and numbered, ready for easy transport. I saw knowledge as a product that had weight. Some courses weighed more than others. I received credit for courses, but little credit for myself as a learner. I did not think of giving myself credit. Credit came from others who had enough knowledge and authority to assess my progress. I wonder now what present students give themselves credit for as I watch them adding up their official credits to see if they have "enough."

I remember our psychology professor telling us how we were to keep our notes which had to be handed in and checked. We got 10% of our course mark for "good notes." That was an easy 10% for me because I knew how to do what I was told. Since our professor was telling us what we needed to know, this knowledge was valuable and recording it correctly would ensure that, if I studied hard, I would do well on the exam. One of his favorite phrases was "Let me throw this up to you." I remember having an

uncontrollable case of the giggles during one class as I imagined all this "knowledge" being "thrown up." My most vivid recollection from that course is that rhesus monkeys prefer cloth mothers to wire mothers. I dutifully read, listened, and wrote. However, there was no place for the conversations that I now know help me to construct meaning from information. Now, as I watch students pour over their notes and textbooks, I wonder what parts connect with their own knowing and what parts stay on paper.

English 288 was hermetically packaged and sealed. Our text was a programmed grammar book. It rewarded us for having the right answers. It did not do much to help those who had the wrong answers. When our professor told us we would need "a good dictionary," I wondered what he meant. I had not thought about the possibility of different kinds of dictionaries. However, if we were to purchase a "good" one, there must be some "bad" ones. Having my curiosity peaked by the possibility of different kinds of dictionaries, I approached him hesitantly after class to ask him what he meant by "a good dictionary." He seemed offended, his body language clearly stating that he did not have the time or inclination to enter into conversation about such a trivial matter. I was put in my place with his terse response, "Any good dictionary." When I finally asked in frustration, "Do you mean a plain, ordinary dictionary?" he replied there was no such thing as a plain ordinary dictionary and walked out the door. I learned that not only were there appropriate answers, there were also appropriate questions and I obviously had not asked one. I wondered then how I could learn to converse in an area when someone who knew would not talk with me. I wonder now how present students experience the opening up and closing off of conversational opportunity.

I remember our Children's Literature professor pacing back and forth at the front of the room with his hand on his forehead lamenting the impossibility of ever communicating his own meaning of words to us because of the barriers of connotative differences. As the nun who sat beside me whispered, "That poor man," I wondered how she could be so sympathetic to his plight. I felt guilty for resenting him and admired her "Christian charity." How could I use this literature with children when all I was getting were adult interpretations -- his interpretations which he could not express coherently. Now I understand that he may have been trying desperately to channel constructed knowledge into received knowledge; knowledge he may have been trying to transmit without transforming either the knowledge or the students. He was trying to transmit his voice for us to mimic rather than helping us find our own. The only voice there seemed to be room for was his. I wonder where there is room for the voices of present students.

I dreaded heading over to the Physical Education Building, changing, and "vigorously participating" in games and activities which I felt were so disconnected from

"real activities." I found nothing constructive or meaningful about them. The structure was always predetermined -- rigid rules, keeping score, winners and losers. We were playing within someone else's predetermined scheme. In many ways it seemed like another version of the academic game I was playing. We played stick hockey in the gym. A nun on our team would hide the puck in her skirt and, while the other team was looking for the puck, she would scurry down to their net and flip it into their goal. I loved it! She could see possibilities beyond the rules for making the game her own -- something I was not able to do. Now I wonder how present students experience the rules they have to play by. I wonder if they know how to make the game their own.

For me, the knowledge and the rules belonged to someone else. Following their rules to get their knowledge seemed to involve being competitive whether I felt competent or not. This was very different from other learning experiences such as my musical experience.

I had played classical accordion since the age of eight. Part of my experience involved yearly solo competitions. We would each enter the particular category in which we felt competent, then practice that particular solo for months. I worked hard and always felt competent. The competitions were based on striving to improve and we cheered each other on, listening carefully for technical expertise and artistic interpretation. Another part of my musical experience involved playing in a band with 150 other players. I loved the practices and the performances. In that band there was an incredible sense of collaboration and cooperation that I have sometimes experienced as a classroom teacher but do not remember as part of my undergraduate experience. I loved the way we worked together, each contributing our own part to the whole. We each had an essential part to play -- each part different but necessary. Each player counted. Anticipation and participation were integral parts of the performance. Having a 43 measure rest was an important contribution to the whole. Silence allowed space for others' musical themes to emerge. The music was harmonious when all players played their parts. I wonder how present students come to understand cooperation and competition.

When, during my first term as an undergraduate, I was required to write a paper supporting the advantages of either heterogeneous or homogeneous grouping, I believed I had no opinion of my own on this issue. However, because I had been well prepared in Grade 12 on how to use the Periodical Indexes, I decided to look up as many articles as I could find and support the side where I found the most articles. Heterogeneous grouping won out. I strung several quotes together and, in an attempt to make the paper more real and readable, I added Mary and Jane Briggs, identical twins who were each placed in a

different type of grouping. Mary flourished and Jane withered. I got ten out of ten on my paper.

When I noticed an Alberta Teachers' Association (ATA) Essay Contest advertised on the bulletin board, I decided to enter my paper. I had felt good about the paper when I wrote it -- a feeling I now connect with having expressed a particular point of view well. My professor must have felt good about it too because his response had been 10/10. In early Spring I was notified that I had won first prize and my paper would be published in the ATA Magazine. When I received my complimentary copy and opened it to my article, I began shaking. Someone had added, "Margaret Logan knocks a sacred cow." I didn't know there was a sacred cow. I wrote on the side where I found the most articles.

Seeing my article in print seemed to give it a sense of authority. I, who had constructed a paper based on the ideas of others, would be read by others as if I knew what I was talking about. I wondered how many other articles were published by people who did not know what they were talking about. Had I used some of those kinds of articles in my article? I felt out of place in this academic conversation. Because I saw knowledge as something to be received from experts, I felt out of place with the voices of experts. I began silently to question the voices of experts who also might have been imposters.

The next year, while working in the Reserve Room of the Education Library, several students asked me for copies of my article which had been put on a reserve reading list for a course. I did not admit to anyone that I had written it. Because I believed that students learn by reading articles written by those who know more than they do, I worried that my article might set me "above" other students. I worried that if I were found out, my sense of security and belonging might be threatened.

When I met my professor twenty years later, I reintroduced myself. His face lit with recognition. "Of course!" he responded. "You wrote that article in the ATA Magazine. It was an excellent review of the literature and was used in several theses." Twenty years ago, I had felt no connection with "the literature." I wonder now if present students feel connected to the literature.

An incident from one of my Curriculum and Instruction courses is particularly vivid. One day during Math class, after about fifteen minutes of lecture, our instructor stopped, stating there was no point in continuing. Obviously we were not "getting" what he was trying to "get across." He apologized for not being well enough prepared and told us to come back for the next class. He was going to rethink the lesson in order to present the concepts more clearly. I was amazed. I did not know a lesson could fail. I did not know you could stop if it was not working. I did not know there were different

approaches that could be used. I did not know you could rethink a lesson. I did not know that a teacher could sense (or care) if the students were "getting it" during the lesson. This was the only example I remember of one of my teachers thinking and talking about his own teaching. I did not know there were different ways. I had always thought knowledge was prepackaged into courses ready for shipment. However, this one experience was not enough to make me realize that learning is a human process of continual reconstruction. Our instructor was young and I thought he had not yet figured out how to do it "right." As I think back on my surprise, I wonder what incidents surprise present students. What incidents awaken them to new ways of constructing meaning?

Somewhere in the middle of receiving knowledge about teaching, I was required to go out and practice what I had received. I felt little connection between my university experiences, my practica experiences, and my personal experiences. I began, and left, my practica with little sense of teaching or of children. While I remember my cooperating teachers as pleasant, I do not remember support or criticism. The only "lesson" I remember was reading the book "The King, the Mice, and the Cheese" to the students. I remember no feeling of connection between myself and the students or myself and the lessons. A faculty consultant came to my room twice and observed my lessons for about ten minutes each time. Later he talked to me briefly about the lessons and disappeared. My practica were no more real than my other courses. Knowledge remained on paper -- teacher manuals, lesson plans, student worksheets, and my evaluation form. The practica are much longer now but I wonder if students make more connections than I did. What do they take away besides an evaluation form? I wonder what "lessons" they learn.

I remember studying for exams, hoping I could remember everything I had been taught. I also worried about my "results" when others would let me know if I knew enough, if my responses were appropriate. I understood what course weight meant. Six courses carried from September to April were almost too much to bear. I remember walking under the weight of final exams, unable to feel or see anything but the oppressive weight of the "knowledge" I had to carry on my shoulders, ready to regurgitate and prove that I "knew it." Exams often left me with the relief of bulemic purging. I got it all out, in order to make room for the next course. My academic "knowledge" had been transferred back to its original source in a vicious academic circle. I enjoyed writing exams in areas where I felt competent. I was able to express myself in peace and quiet. It was my turn to let people know what I knew instead of listening to what they knew. However, it was not often when my knowledge and their exam questions connected. While I wanted to tell what I knew, that did not seem to be what they wanted to hear. I wonder now if students

mean something similar when I hear them say, "The mark I got does not reflect what I learned."

Some of my fondest university memories are of the times I spent with other students talking in the student lounge. Although I do not remember what we talked about, I know our conversations were meaningful to me. The conversations helped me find my way and make connections within the disconnected life of the university. There was time to talk and time to listen. Sharing experiences through conversation allowed me to feel part of a "community of students."

We never saw a professor in that student lounge (in the basement of Education South). They came to class, lectured, and disappeared. I discovered as a graduate student that there was another lounge on the tenth floor for graduate students and staff. Perhaps they disappeared to that lounge. They might have had office hours. If they did, I did not go. If I had gone to their offices, I would have had to have something important to say or to ask. I did not feel comfortable doing either. I saw my personal knowing and academic knowing as separate. I read what was assigned, did the required course work, and received a mark. Now, as I see professors and students mingling in the two common lounges that did not exist when I was an undergraduate, I wonder if the conversations I hear are the voices of an emerging "education community."

I graduated in the summer of 1968. I was glad to be finished. The courses had drained every ounce of energy I had. I shut my text books, filed my notes, and moved into the "real world" of teaching.

I remember choosing education as a profession because it was easier to continue in a system I was familiar with than to venture off into an unknown area. Teaching seemed to offer the stability and security with which I was familiar. When I began teaching, I soon learned this stability and security did not exist.

I had been hired to teach Grade 2 at the school where I had completed an internship program. Knowing the school, the teachers, and some of the students helped me feel comfortable about starting to teach my own class. After the first teachers' meeting in September, my principal told me the enrollment was down and he would need to get rid of a teacher -- me. I was numb. Where was the security that I had expected? I wonder if present students are aware of the uncertainties of teaching.

When I entered a different school the next day, I was terrified. Recognizing a teacher from one of my summer school classes gave me the courage to get settled in this new school. I would be teaching in the gym until a portable classroom arrived. I had a blackboard perched on an easel, thirty desks, and lots of paper and books. I spent hours each night making up separate worksheets for four reading groups. I followed the

manuals rigorously. When a supervisor came from the school board to observe how I was doing, she was very complimentary. The only criticism, a technical one, was that I was using bond paper when newsprint was cheaper. Even here paper seemed to be a primary concern.

I remember feeling an incredible sense of responsibility that whole first year. Everything the children did was my responsibility. After all, I was now an "expert." I was supposed to not only know what I was doing, but know what was right for my students as well. Not only did I need to know, but I needed to get students to listen to what I knew. Listening carefully had not prepared me for this. The lack of resonance between my personal knowing and my professional preparation left me wondering whose voice I should use. Now I wonder if present students have a sense of knowing their own voice within teacher education contexts.

When the vice principal came in one day and offered to take my class so that I could spend time planning or preparing, I did not accept. I felt I was supposed to know what I was doing and could not impose my responsibilities on someone else. I was living the myth of teacher as expert, as one who knows all. Now I wonder if present students will live that myth too.

By my second year I began to construct my own lessons, to speak and to listen to myself. I began to use the teacher manuals as resources for suggestions. Sometimes I used the manuals. Sometimes I made up something new. However, when I made up something, I felt guilty because I was never sure if I was "teaching these students what they were supposed to learn." I wonder how present students make sense of what students are supposed to learn.

While I now know that a lot of my professional development came from listening to my students, I did not think of it as professional development at the time. I did not think of myself as a learner, but as a teacher who should already know. Learning from my students often gave me a sense of guilt rather than pleasure. Professional development meant other people coming into the school to tell me how to do things. They told, I listened, and teaching went on as usual. Through conversations with other teachers, I began to hear my own voice as one filled with professional knowledge. This was a very different kind of knowledge from the knowledge I had received at university. I wonder how present students think about professional development and constructing professional knowledge.

As I continued teaching, I had a growing sense that I knew what I was doing. I began to give myself credit for knowing about teaching. I also began to sense that I wanted something more but I did not know what it was. When I finally returned to

university to do a master's degree, I soon felt like Rip Van Winkle. Why did it take so long to wake up? I wonder whether students' experiences today educate them to be awake, to listen to their own voices, and to the voices of their students. I wonder if they value questions as well as answers. I wonder if they develop a sense of the excitement of being a learner.

Shaping the Inquiry

> If only one knew the meaning of one's question! If one could only ask it properly or formulate it more precisely! Is it really a question? Or is it a deep concern that finds no words that do it justice?
>
> (Kaufmann in Buber, 1970, p.32)

My wonders about the ways in which education students come to understandings of teaching and learning in the contexts of their teacher education programs do not take the shape of a question that can be answered. Rather, I have tried to create spaces where the concerns behind the wonders can emerge and be voiced through narrative inquiry with students. Gadamer (1975) describes how questions are not brought into the open for inquiry until they are shaped by the questioner's presuppositions and concerns. In order to flexibly shape spaces in which meaning can emerge "we *name* the things to which we will attend and *frame* the context in which we will attend to them" (Schon, 1983, p. 40). Through conversation, I have paid attention to the ways in which two preservice teacher education students have constructed knowledge by authoring stories from their experiences within their contexts of teacher education.

CHAPTER TWO

CONNECTIONS WITH THE LITERATURE

> There was some difficulties about "the history," because they wanted to know the "salient facts," and I wanted to tell them everything -- the entire story. Besides, I wasn't quite certain what might or might not be "salient" in the circumstances.
>
> (Oliver Sacks, 1984, p. 47)

Situating the Inquiry

The wonders that have emerged for me during the telling and retelling of my stories of teacher education are seldom talked about in the literature on teacher education. The conversations I had as a student and those I now have with students seldom connect with research conversations.

The dominant orientation of positivism in educational research (Tom & Valli, 1990) has led to a vast body of knowledge that "looks at" and "talks about" teacher education from the solid high ground of theory (Schon, 1987). As Carter (1990) states:

> For the most part, attention in teacher education has traditionally been focused on what teachers need to know and how they can be trained, rather than on what they actually know or how that knowledge is acquired. The perspective, in other words, has been from the outside, external to the teachers who are learning and the processes by which they are educated. (p. 291)

This orientation pervades not only the research that is done, but "can influence what the practitioner views as real, believes to be achievable, knows how to do, and decides to do" (Tom & Valli, 1990, p. 379). I see this view as a tension embedded within my own story and the stories that I hear told by present students.

Much of the research on education students has an antecedent-outcome orientation (Yarger & Smith, 1990) with the emphasis being placed on the product as perceived by those deemed qualified to judge -- researchers, teacher educators, and teachers in the field. "This black box mentality . . . severely limits the ability of researchers to understand the richness of teacher education programs" (Yarger & Smith, 1990, p. 39). Much of this research concludes that education students learn very little of practical or theoretical value (Miklos & Greene, 1987) and most of what is learned is wiped out when one enters the profession (Lortie, 1975). The question of what <u>is</u> learned as perceived by the learner is

seldom addressed. Both Carter (1990) and Grant and Secada (1990) point to the need for examining what teacher education students learn and how they learn it.

The view of "knowledge as product," separate from the knower, leads to goals of teacher education that focus on the production of teachers rather than on the development of learners. In this view students' experiences are seldom valued in themselves. Student experience is often compared to some baseline external to the student. Thus, the student as person is often overshadowed by the student-as-potential-teacher. There is little space for the meanings that the students make, for the stories that they live and tell.

Terms such as "cultural baggage" (Britzman, 1986) and "cultural tool kit" (Bruner, 1990) point to the embeddedness of the potential teacher within a personal, historical, and socially constructed world-view. Personal practical knowledge research (Clandinin, 1986, 1989) is beginning to explore connections between the personal and professional knowledge of teachers. These ideas lead to a more holistic way of understanding teachers as persons who embody personally and socially constructed images of practice.

Education students have already experienced 12 or more years of apprenticeship (Lortie, 1975) through their own schooling. They do not enter teacher education as a "tabula rasa." They often believe that they already know what teaching is all about (Britzman, 1986; Calderhead, 1989; Lortie, 1975). Finding ways to work with education students in ways that allow them to reflect upon their personal knowledge as they engage in conversations with theory, teacher educators, cooperating teachers, and each other may open possibilities for them to teach in better ways than they were taught and see themselves as knowledgeable professionals.

In the inquiry presented here, I take the epistemological stance of knowledge constructed and reconstructed through experience. In this orientation knowledge is not seen as separate from the knower (Dewey & Bentley, 1949), but knowledge is described as socially constructed and negotiated as individuals continuously interact with the world. This orientation, silently valued by both practitioners (Schon, 1983) and researchers (Tom & Valli, 1990), is beginning to become an authorized version of both the research story and the teacher education curriculum story.

The notion that knowledge is constructed through experience has been described by Dewey (1938) and examined by a variety of researchers. Researchers have described this experiential knowing as knowing-in-action (Schon, 1983, 1987), craft knowledge (Tom & Valli, 1990), constructed knowledge (Bruffee, 1986; Duckworth, 1986; Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Kelly, 1955), embodied knowledge (Johnston, 1989; Polanyi, 1966), pedagogical thoughtfulness (Van Manen, 1986), and personal practical knowledge (Clandinin & Connelly, 1986; Britzman, 1989; Elbaz, 1981).

In this inquiry I have adopted a view of students as entering the contexts of teacher education with their own personal practical knowledge (Clandinin, 1986, 1989; Johnston, 1989). Connelly and Clandinin (1988) define personal practical knowledge as "a moral, affective, and aesthetic way of knowing life's educational situations" (p. 59). This knowledge is embodied within the individual as well as embedded within the individual's socio-historical contexts. Students construct and reconstruct meaning based on this knowledge (Duckworth, 1986).

Dewey's (1938) description of experience as continuous and interactive has provided a major point of entry for me in this inquiry. Each person lives within his/her own continuity of experience filled with individual memories, actions, and intentions. This individual continuity is always in interaction with the social and physical environment. While meaning is continually constructed by each individual based on his/her continuity of experience, this construction is negotiated within a social context. Through interaction, meaning is continually reconstructed as new interactions lead to further negotiation.

This constructivist view of knowledge as personally and socially constructed through negotiation (Bruffee, 1986) implies there needs to be room for all participants to voice their ideas. In educational research, the predominant voice has been that of the researcher (Gitlin, 1990). While research on teaching is beginning to make room for the voices of teachers (Carter, 1990), the silence of students in teacher education is deafening. Britzman (1989) describes how "the idea of voice as a central construct in educational research attempts to remedy the traditionally imposed silence of research subjects as primarily spoken about but rarely speaking for themselves" (p. 145). In the present inquiry, focusing on the voices of teacher education students has been of central importance.

In this inquiry, I have taken the stance of "listening to" teacher education students rather than "looking at" them. Britzman (1989) and Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger and Tarule (1986) point out the importance of voice in the development of self and community. Listening to the voices of students can help us build a stronger educational community and help develop better understandings of what learning and teaching mean to education students. Through conversations with teacher education students it has been possible to explore possibilities for student voices in teacher education as well as to explore the lived tensions created by different voices in the social negotiation of learning to teach.

Researchers who have written about the need for teacher education students to give voice to their experience include Clandinin, Davies, Hogan, and Kennard (1993), Britzman (1989), Dow (1979), Johnston (1991), and Lyons (1990). However, the ways

in which students construct meaning within the teacher education context of the university and the connections they make between their university experience, their practica experience, and their personal experience need to be examined more closely. This research will not only increase understanding for teacher educators, but, as Britzman (1986) points out, "student teachers [also] need to understand how the interaction between time, place, people, ideas, and personal growth contributes to the process of professional development" (p. 443). Thus the ways in which teacher education students have constructed and reconstructed knowledge through their personal experiences of teacher education in the contexts of university classrooms and school classrooms can provide all learners -- educators, students, and researchers -- with a better understanding of the socially interactive nature of learning to teach.

Eisner (1988) describes curriculum as a mind altering process. Curriculum is much more than the presentation and reception of information and yet little attention has been paid to the process of how individual students shape and are shaped by the curriculum of teacher education. At the same time, teacher education is a social process. Britzman (1986) points out that "teacher education, like any education, is an ideological education. It promotes particular images of power, knowledge, and values by rewarding particular forms of individual and institutional behavior" (p. 443). Yet the ways in which the curriculum of being socialized into the teaching profession is experienced by students in teacher education programs have seldom been a topic of serious inquiry. Ginsburg and Clift (1990) point to the dominant socialization story when they describe the hidden curriculum as "learning to be 'docile' and to give those in charge 'what they want'" (p. 452). Their description of the nature of curriculum knowledge as public versus personal, knowledge as molecular versus holistic, and knowledge as given versus problematic was part of my story as an undergraduate student. In the present inquiry, I focus on the personal, holistic and problematic nature of the curriculum as experienced by teacher education students.

Research focusing on the practicum component of teacher education is often based on an analysis of the teaching performance using criteria established by those other than the student teacher. As Britzman (1989) points out:

> Conventional notions attend to the problem of meaning as a technical issue of classroom management and displace a critical reading of the deeper contradictions and cultural tensions arising from how schools structure curriculum and how the daily experience of this structure shapes the struggle for voice and the meaning of experience in education. (p. 144)

The personal meaning the experience has for the student as well as the ways in which the student integrates his/her university coursework with the practicum component of his/her program have been neglected.

Because I understand stories to be expressions of personal practical knowledge, I have worked with students' stories in order to explore collaboratively how they construct and reconstruct meaning. As Connelly and Clandinin (1990) state, "people are both living their stories in an ongoing experiential text and telling their stories in words as they reflect upon life and explain themselves to others" (p. 4). I have worked with teacher education students in order to hear their stories as they constructed and reconstructed their personal practical knowledge of teaching during the professional year of their teacher education program when they spent time in university classes and school classrooms in order to come to a better understanding of part of the complex process of learning to teach.

In the following sections of this chapter, I first discuss ways in which knowledge is constructed from experience and describe two modes of constructing knowledge. I then focus on the narrative qualities of experience and describe how we can think of ourselves as authoring our lives. Next, I focus on the importance of conversation in constructing knowledge. I conclude this chapter with a discussion of the contexts of teacher education in which my inquiry was situated.

Knowledge Constructed from Experience

My research is epistemologically situated in Dewey's (1938) theory of learning through experience. We live and are what we experience. Our knowledge of the world and of ourselves in the world emerges from our experience. As Eisner writes in his forward to Teachers as Curriculum Planners (Connelly & Clandinin, 1988), "Experience is what people undergo, the kinds of meanings they construe as they teach and learn, and the personal ways in which they interpret the worlds in which they live" (p. ix).

Experience as Continuous and Interactive

We are living *in* the world while at the same time being part *of* the world. Thus, as Dewey (1958) states "experience is *of* as well as *in* nature" (p. 4a). As individuals in the world we are each unique and separate beings, isolated in our own continuity of experience with our own unique biography. At the same time, being part of the world places us in an interactive relationship that constitutes a sharing of experience. Dewey (1938) states that "the two principles of continuity and interaction are not separate from

each other. They intercept and unite. They are, so to speak, the longitudinal and lateral aspects of experience" (p. 43).

What we choose to attend to, and thus what we choose to make sense of from our experience, depends on both our individual continuity of experience and our interaction in context with the world. The individual continuity of experience is embedded within a socio-cultural, historical context which both shapes and is shaped by particular representations of experience (Crites, 1971; Gadamer, 1975; Kelly, 1955). At the same time, each individual's continuity of experience interacts with the larger social continuity of experience in a dialectic tension. While personal practical knowledge is continually constructed and reconstructed by each individual based on his/her continuity of experience, these constructions are negotiated within a social context. Through interaction, meaning is continually reconstructed as new interactions lead to further negotiation.

Each of us constructs different knowledge based on our individual continuity of experience. Thus, each of us constructs unique personal practical knowledge (Clandinin, 1986) from our experience. This knowledge is individually unique while at the same time shaped by knowledge constructed from the socio-historical contexts in which we live. The ways in which teacher education students construct and reconstruct their personal practical knowledge of teaching and learning as these two aspects of experience intercept and unite have been central to the present inquiry.

The Centrality of Voice in Representing Experience

As Eisner (1988) states, "knowledge is rooted in experience and requires a form for its representation" (p. 15). One of the most pervasive ways of representing experience is through language (Barrett, 1979; Bruffee, 1986; Bruner, 1986, 1990; Dewey & Bentley, 1949). In our formal institutions, there is seldom any other way. Thus it is not experience itself, but language and memory that enable us to interpret and make sense of our experience. Van Manen (1990) states that "we are able to recall and reflect on experience thanks to language" (p. 39) and describes lived experience as having a linguistic structure.

The moment we are born, we cry out with a voice that announces our individual living presence in the world while at the same time calling for a response from that world. Voice becomes a crucial link in the transactions (Dewey, 1938) between individual continuity and social interaction. Voice both sets us apart and connects us to others. Brown and Gilligan (1992) tell us

> Voice, because it is embodied, connects rather than separates psyche and body; because voice is in language, it also joins psyche and culture. Voice is inherently relational -- one does not require a mirror to hear oneself -- yet the sounds of one's voice change in resonance depending on the relational acoustics; whether one is heard or not heard, how one is responded to (by oneself and by others). p. 20

We construct knowledge as we represent our experience in ways that express our understanding of the world to others. In order to be part of the community into which we are born, we shape our voice in relationship with others as we attempt to have our ideas listened to and understood. While we each construct and reconstruct knowledge in different ways, certain authorized versions of what counts as knowledge are constructed as consensus is reached among individual voices. Truth claims are based on agreement among groups of individuals. Bruffee (1986) tells us

> Knowledge is identical with the symbol system (i.e., the language) in which it is formulated. The community of knowledgeable peers constituted by that symbol system constructs knowledge by justifying it socially, that is, by arriving at a sort of consensus. (p. 779)

Thus, knowledge is negotiated in social situations as people come to agreements about what is the most useful way to think about issues.

When knowledge is viewed as a social construction, "knowing is co-operative and as such is integral with communication" (Dewey & Bentley, 1949, p. vi). We not only use language to collect our thoughts and shape our experience, language also allows us to share our thoughts about experience with others. As Gitlin (1990) states, "the development of voice . . . reshapes roles so that disenfranchised members have the right to tell their stories and the opportunity to examine underlying assumptions" (p. 460).

When language is exclusive, many voices are silenced. Authority becomes an issue of who gets listened to as well as what kinds of knowledge are useful in living better lives. When exclusive language is used, meaning is negotiated by a small minority and the silent majority are oppressed. "Restoring voice requires acknowledging relationships: the individual relationship to the meaning of his or her experience, and hence to language, and the individual's relationship to others, since understanding is a social process" (Britzman, 1989, p. 146).

Two Modes of Constructing Knowledge

Eisner (1988) distinguishes two factors central to all experience, "the qualities themselves and the conceptual structures we bring to them" (p. 15). We construct

knowledge from experience and author different versions of knowledge depending on the conceptual structures we choose. Two ways in which we attempt to understand our world are through the construction of theories and the construction of stories. Bruner (1986) calls these two the paradigmatic and narrative modes of knowing.

The Paradigmatic Mode: Decontextualized Knowledge

The paradigmatic mode "deals in general causes, and in their establishment, and makes use of procedures to assure verifiable reference and to test for empirical truth" (Bruner, 1986, p. 13). In this representation knowledge is abstracted from experience. These abstractions are removed from the contextual contingencies of experience and take the form of principles, propositions, and theories. These abstractions become a body of knowledge separate from individual knowers and take on the appearance of being certain, static, and objective (objects separate from the knower) -- "the way it is." This conception of knowledge is based on the belief that there are underlying essential objective truths about reality. In this version knowledge construction is "driven by principled hypotheses" (Bruner, 1986, p. 13). Principles, propositions, and theories are used to explain, predict, control and evaluate our world, including the worlds constructed by individual persons. Initially taken from experience, this body of knowledge can be used to cover over the contextual contingencies of individuals' experience. As Clandinin and Connelly (1990) state "it is a view that implies that no matter what any particular person happens to believe about it, there is a correct and true view of the world. It is a depersonalized notion of truth and meaning" (p. 242).

The search for absolute truth is compelling, for if we can know the right way, we can arrive at consensus and thus live in harmony. In this view, rightness is valued as decontextualized truth and perfection seems possible. Bruffee (1986) tells us that in this mode of thought we assume "that there must be a universal foundation, a ground, a base, a framework, a structure of some sort behind knowledge or beneath it, upon which what we know is built, assuring its certainty or truth" (p. 776). Anyone wanting to gain certain knowledge would then need to negate the contextual contingencies of personal experience and opinion and trust the certainty of cognitive reason. As Clandinin and Connelly (1990) state, "a disembodied mind permits the certainty needed by technical rationalism" (p. 242).

The methodological split of mind from body, and subject from object led to the belief that knowledge gained by rational objectivism was superior to that gained by subjective experience. This version has left us with a legacy of doubting all things that have not been proven as well as the notion of reductionism where knowledge is built up from a basic truth. Reductionism has led to extensive specialization, compartmentalization,

and a hierarchical structure of knowledge. It reflects Ginsburg and Clift's (1990) description of curriculum knowledge as public, molecular, and given. This version of knowledge provides a pervasive hegemony as the legitimate authority of technical rationalism, shaping our society and thus our experience. McCormack, in his 1899 preface to Discourse on Method, stated that "all [Descartes'] achievements, far as they may seem from the common life, are shot through the warp and woof of our technical civilisation, and our entire spiritual and material existence bears their hidden impress" (Descartes, 1989, p. iii). These values and beliefs pervade our whole society and education systems and their importance in our institutions cannot be overemphasized (Barrett, 1979; Bruffee, 1986; Crites, 1971; Guba & Lincoln, 1990; Schon, 1983).

This static and finite view of knowledge enables individuals to get or have an education. It is also perceived that this kind of knowledge can be objectively transmitted from those who know to those who do not. Thus the knower receives knowledge from those who know more or better. Since in this version knowledge is perceived as objective fact, it can be learned completely and need not be questioned.

The Narrative Mode: Contextualized Knowledge

The narrative mode "deals in human or human-like intention and action and the vicissitudes and consequences that mark their course. It strives to put its timeless miracles into the particulars of experience, and to locate the experience in time and place" (Bruner, p. 13). In this representation knowledge is seen as embodied and personally and socially constructed through the continuous and interactive nature of experience. Eisler (1987) tells us

> The human psyche seems to have a built-in need for a system of stories and symbols that "reveal" to us the order of the universe and tell us what our place within it is. It is a hunger for meaning and purpose seemingly beyond the power of any rationalistic or logical system to provide. (p. 183)

Dewey's (1938) description of experience as continuous and interactive is central to the narrative mode where knowledge is intrinsic within each individual and grows through personal connections with others. Each person lives within his/her own continuity of experience filled with individual memories, actions, and intentions. This individual continuity is always in interaction with the social and physical environment.

Narrative knowledge of experience is constructed and reconstructed as we tell stories of our experience to explain ourselves to ourselves and to others. Bruner (1986) tells us "the narrative mode leads to conclusions not about certainties in an aboriginal

world, but about the varying perspectives that can be constructed to make experience comprehensible" (p. 37). Our stories are constructed from the particulars of experience and are expressions of our personal practical knowledge. Our personal practical knowledge (Clandinin, 1986) is embodied as well as embedded within socio-cultural historical contexts. Personal practical knowledge forms and reforms as we interact with others.

When subjective experience rather than rational objectivism is taken as the basis for constructing knowledge, narrative knowledge constructed and reconstructed through experience opens up a variety of modes of knowing that can be explored. We can begin to inquire not only about what we know, but how we know, how our knowing changes, and how we experience our knowing. As Dewey and Bentley (1949) state, this view of knowing, which they call transactional, "installs an openness and flexibility in the very process of knowing. It treats knowledge as itself inquiry -- as a goal *within* inquiry, not as a terminus outside or beyond inquiry" (p. vi). This view opens up possibilities for beginning to understand not only what students learn, but how they negotiate meaning in the socially constructed interactive contexts of teacher education.

The view of knowledge as embodied within individuals who interpret experience through personally and socially constructed symbolic forms has been foundational to this inquiry. This view of knowledge does not separate the knower from the known. Rather, we are seen as knowing beings who continually construct and reconstruct knowledge to represent experience. It is a personal, holistic, and problematic (Ginsburg & Clift, 1990) view of knowledge.

These two modes lead to different views of what counts as authorized knowledge, the procedures for constructing knowledge, and the relationship of the knower to the known.

The Relationship of the Knower to the Known

Two ontological views about the nature of knowledge underlie the paradigmatic and narrative modes of knowledge construction. Each one provides different answers to the epistemological question "what is the relationship of the knower to the known?" framed by Guba and Lincoln (1989, p. 83) and discussed in depth by Dewey and Bentley (1949). Each view has implications for both the methods we choose for becoming knowledgeable as well as the ways in which we assess the value of what we know. The versions we choose to live shape our views of authority and accountability in our relationships with others.

The Authority of Reason: A Position of Status

Here the knower and the known are seen as two separate entities, and paradigmatic knowledge is available for transmission from those who know to those who do not. Because this version of knowledge is hierarchically organized (Bruner, 1986), the more of this knowledge one is able to accumulate, the more authority one will have. This is a formal, public version of knowledge and authority is conferred on individuals by society according to pre-established criteria. Those who already have the knowledge decide when others know enough to be credited as authorities themselves.

In order to transmit this knowledge, one must know enough, that is, more than those who will be receiving the knowledge, and must be able to convey this knowledge clearly so others will understand. One must also be persuasive in order to convince others that the version of knowledge constructed is credible and more worthy of being accepted than alternate versions. There is space for only one version of truth.

Authority is based on status where power and control are in the hands of those who have the knowledge. Response to this version of authority becomes one of acceptance, rejection, or a search for further clarification. The authorized version dominates. A person's position of authority can be threatened when the knowledge the person holds is called into question. Discrediting a person's knowledge discredits his/her authority and position of status.

As Munby and Russell (1993) point out, this view of authority is pervasive in the way we think about the relationship between teachers and students.

> In their many years of schooling preservice teachers have seen two basic concepts of authority at work: the authority of reason and the authority of position. The goal of education can be cast in terms of establishing knowledge claims on the authority of reason, but there are times when claims are seen to rest on the teacher's authority of position (Russell, 1983). Preservice teachers are poised to move from being subject to their own teachers' authority of position to taking charge and, as students turned teachers, assuming authority of position over those they teach. (p. 9)

The Authority of Experience: Persons in Relation

In the narrative version of knowledge construction, authority comes from experience and is integral as each person both shapes his/her own knowledge and is shaped by the knowledge of others. Our knowledge of the world and of ourselves in the world emerges from our experience. Knowledge is personally and socially constructed and reconstructed in situations as people share their ideas with others. Everyone is a

knower whose ideas deserve to be heard. In this version, voice involves both expressing oneself and being heard.

In this version, authority grows in strength for each individual as he/she becomes more and more experienced. Thus a person's knowledge grows through experience where "the principle of continuity of experience means that every experience both takes up something from those which have gone before and modifies in some way the quality of those which come after" (Dewey, 1938, p. 35). Thus, we do not "get" or "have" an education, but rather "become more experienced" (Gadamer, 1975).

Munby and Russell (1993) point out that education students "seem reluctant to listen to or to trust their own experiences as an authoritative source of knowledge about teaching, and we wonder how and to what extent they will begin to hear the voice of their own experiences as they begin their teaching careers" (p. 11).

Brown (1991) begins to uncover ways to change this story in her work with adolescent girls. She says, "To be an authority on their own experience requires another person who will acknowledge them as such, not simply an audience but a relationship in which they are taken seriously" (p. 84).

The narrative mode of thought is a central focus of this inquiry. In the next sections, I explore the narrative mode in more detail.

The Narrative Qualities of Experience

I now focus on the ways in which narrative knowledge is constructed and reconstructed through experience and I describe the continuous and interactive nature of narrative knowledge. I describe personal practical knowledge as narrative knowledge which is expressed in and through the stories we live and tell.

Clandinin and Connelly (1990) describe the linguistic structure of experience as narrative in quality where "narrative is a reconstruction of a person's experience in relation to others and to a social milieu" (p. 244). In this sense, narrative knowledge is both embodied in the individual's continuity of experience as well as embedded within this individual's socio-historical context.

Temporal Continuity

Crites (1971) thoughtfully explicates ways in which we not only tell stories about our experience, but how "the whole experience, as it is concentrated in a conscious present, has a narrative form" (p. 303). The ways in which we choose to make sense of our experience affect more than the present moment. The very essence of experience is its

temporality, its continuity. Experience happens in the present. However, the conscious present is more than an isolated point in time. As Crites (1971) states:

> The conscious present is that of a body impacted in a world and moving, in process, in that world. In the present action and experience meet. Memory is its depth, the depth of its experience in particular; anticipation is its trajectory, the trajectory of its action in particular. (p. 303)

This threefold present contains past memories, present actions, and future intentions (Ricoeur, 1983; Schutz, 1970; van den Berg, 1972). The past is not an isolated past, but a past present always intending toward an imagined future. Crites goes on to describe how "we anticipate by framing little stories about how things may fall out. As the term *scenario* implies, these anticipatory stories are very thin and vague as compared with the dense, sharp details of the chronicle of memory" (p. 302). Schutz (1970) describes these scenarios as projections, "a mere sketch with many empty places and variables in it" (p. 130). Schutz goes on to describe how "the experiences I shall have had while carrying out the project will have enlarged and restructured my stock of knowledge" (p. 141). In this way the meaning of experience is continually being constructed and reconstructed as we anticipate the future based on past experience. As each scenario or project is lived through, the actual experience gives us new stories to tell including new ways to retell past experience and new scenarios to envision.

All of us construct and reconstruct knowledge from our individual continuity of experience. But this is only part of the story. Our individual continuity of experience is in continual interaction with our social and physical world. We also have encounters with many other individuals with their own continuities of experience. Our personal practical knowledge shapes and is shaped by these continuous interactions with our environment. As well, we are born into the ongoing narratives of our particular socio-cultural worlds. These cultural narratives are also historically continuous and socially interactive. They too shape and are shaped by individuals.

Intersubjective Connections

Crites (1971) names two fundamental narrative forms that we use simultaneously to describe the personally continuous and socially interactive aspects of experience. The first form Crites names "sacred stories." These anonymous and communal stories are the implicit underlying cultural structures that form our consciousness, our taken-for-granted attitude that we bring to our experience because of the ways in which our world is

presented to us by our social context. They implicitly frame the ways in which we interpret experience.

> Such stories, and the symbolic worlds they project, are not like monuments that men behold, but like dwelling-places. People live in them. Yet even though they are not directly told, even though a culture seems to be the telling rather than teller of these stories, their form seems to be narrative. (p. 295)

According to Heidegger (1977), dwelling-places shape the spaces necessary for building. He describes a space as "something that has been made room for, something that is cleared and free, namely, within a boundary" (p. 332). People build their experience, and the stories they tell about that experience, from the spaces in which they dwell. "*Only if we are capable of dwelling, only then can we build*" (Heidegger, 1977, p. 338). In this way sacred stories provide dwelling-places, or contexts, for the individual "mundane stories" which are told. Crites states that "the mundane stories are also among the most important means by which people articulate and clarify their sense of that world" (p. 296). These are the stories that are directly seen or heard. Mundane stories of individuals' everyday experience each point to, but do not explicitly articulate, the cultural sacred stories. Mundane stories provide examples for hermeneutic inquiry into the underlying sacred stories that are implicitly told. The shared implicit sense of the sacred story allows individuals to participate in an intersubjective reality whereby meaningful connections can be made between individuals. Both sacred and mundane stories "help link men's inner lives as well as orienting them to a common public world" (Crites, p. 304). This sharing of experiential meaning through stories allows for the development of an empathic understanding of the experiences of the other and connects individual's unique experiences in a socially interactive way. "People are able to feel this resonance, because the unutterable stories are those they know best of all" (Crites, p. 297). Our emotions can help us begin to identify these sacred stories. When we feel surprised, angry, afraid, frustrated or confused, we are often bumping the boundaries of a sacred story. Dissonance is a sign of two or more sacred stories confronting each other. This dissonance shakes our deepest beliefs about how the world works and how we fit into that world.

Each sacred story of teaching is embedded to varying degrees both within the institutional contexts of the university and the schools and is embodied within the personal practical knowledge of the individuals with whom students interact. Eisler (1987) tells us

> Even today people still learn from "sacred stories" what is good or evil, what should be imitated or abhorred, and what should be accepted as divinely ordained, not only by oneself but by all others. Through ceremonies and rituals, people also partake in these stories. As a result, the values there expressed penetrate into the deepest recesses of the mind, where, even in our time, they are guarded as hallowed and immutable truths. (p. 84)

In this inquiry, Crites' three dimensions of the narrative quality of experience, the sacred story, the mundane story, and the temporal form of experience, have provided a conceptual base for exploring the personal experience of teacher education students as they interacted with individuals in situations embedded in teacher education contexts.

Authoring a Life

As I think about the narrative quality of experience, I am drawn to exploring the notion of how stories of experience take shape. Because we use our narrative knowledge to interpret and reinterpret our experience, we each construct different stories at different times and in different circumstances. Each person involved in a situation will construct different versions which express his/her own narrative knowledge. The textual quality of narrative knowledge leads to "the notion of multiple or even conflicting interpretations. If all the world is like a text then everyone becomes a reader (and an author)" (Van Manen, 1990, p. 39). It is the sense of authorship that I focus on in this section.

When we understand experience as having a narrative quality, we can begin to think about how we each author our own life. I understand authorship to be the narrative expression of a person's agency and intentionality as he or she constructs meaning through experience. When we think of Dewey's notion of the continuous and interactive nature of experience, this authoring is not a simple matter of setting out on an individual course. Authoring a life is a complex process. This complexity becomes obvious when we consider each person as the author of his/her own life, a life which is continually in interaction with others authoring their lives.

Because lives are not lived in isolation, each of us is the author of his/her own life with its particular characters and plot lines while at the same time being a character in others' stories. As well as being authors of our own lives, we each read and narrate the lives of others (as others read and narrate our lives) through the narrative knowledge constructed and reconstructed from the mundane and sacred stories we have each learned to live and tell. Alasdair MacIntyre (1981) tells us:

> We are always under certain constraints. We enter upon a stage which we did not design and we find ourselves part of an action that was not of our making. Each of us being a main character in his own drama plays subordinate parts in the dramas of others, and each drama constrains the others. (p.199)

We author our lives in concert with others. No life is a solo performance. The complex interplay of these "interlocking" (MacIntyre, 1981) narratives creates dynamic relational qualities as we author our lives based on narrative knowledge constructed and reconstructed from different past memories and future intentions while at the same time being influenced by each other's narrative knowledge and the intersubjective socio-cultural historical narratives we share.

Narratives as Moral Authority

The ways in which we choose to author our lives shape and are shaped by our relationships with others. Since authoring a life involves both telling and living the stories we construct of ourselves and others, by authoring our lives, we take a moral stance (Bruner, 1990) and offer a moral response. Tappan & Brown (1989) tell us

> An individual achieves authorship by authoring his or her own moral story. . . . As such, it also entails *moralizing*; imbuing a story or narrative with moral value, thereby asserting or claiming moral *authority* on behalf of an individual's moral perspective. . . . It also means honoring (or "authorizing") what one thinks, feels, and does with respect to what is right and what is wrong -- even in the face of potential conflict and disagreement. . . . And, finally, it means assuming *responsibility* for one's moral actions, and for acting on behalf of one's moral perspective. (p. 190)

Because our narratives are interconnected, authoring our lives also makes us accountable for the choices we make within our social communities. MacIntyre (1981) describes this mutual response in terms of accountability.

> I am not only accountable. I am one who can always ask others for an account, who can put others to the question. I am part of their story, as they are part of mine. The narrative of any one life is part of an interlocking set of narratives. (p. 203)

Tappan and Brown (1989) tell us "to claim authority and assume responsibility one must be fully aware of the consequences of one's thoughts, feelings, and actions" (p. 192). One way we become aware of the consequences of our actions is through the stories we hear and learn to tell. We also learn about our place in, and relationship with, the world as we interact with others. Mundane stories teach us what we need to know to

author our lives within a particular community. They teach us what we should and should not do; they teach us our place in the community. They let us know if we belong. They teach us how to communicate in acceptable ways and how to respond to others in ways which will be heard. They teach us what to pay attention to from the raw impressions of experience and how to express our knowing in culturally and socially acceptable ways. These stories shape and are shaped by each individual as we author our lives. The more voices supporting a particular version of how to live lives, the more strongly individuals are compelled to author their lives in certain ways in order to fit in. These stories become authorized versions and claim authority because of consensus among individual members in the community. Some of these authorized versions become "sacred stories" when they are known so well they no longer need to be told.

Thus, stories are lived contingently in situations where communal stories develop. These communal stories become authorized versions of how lives should be lived and take on a canonical quality. Bruner (1986) describes the canonical nature of stories in the following way:

> Stories define the range of canonical characters, the settings in which they operate, the actions that are permissible and comprehensible. And thereby they provide, so to speak, a map of possible roles and of possible worlds in which action, thought, and self-definition are permissible (or desirable). (p.66)

While the canonical nature of stories provides subtle and implicit knowledge of how lives should be lived, the importance of stories is often discounted in our educational systems.

In the next section I focus on the educative qualities of experience and show connections between education, experience, and narrative knowledge.

Educative Qualities of Experience

While Dewey (1938) points to the "organic connection between education and personal experience" (p. 25), neither Dewey nor Eisner (1988) equates experience with education. In order for experience to be educative, we need to be able to move past the taken-for-granted attitude and be awake enough to attend carefully to the meanings we construct from our experience. Eisner states:

> Experience is more than a simple given of life. It is not only an event; it is also an achievement. The qualities of the world are there for those who have the skills to take them. It is one of our culture's most significant tasks, one for which our schools have a special responsibility, to provide

> the tools and to develop the skills through which the child can create his or her own experience. (p. 15)

Dewey focuses on the conditions that give experience a worthwhile meaning, describing, along with Maslow (1971) and Rogers (1961), growth as a criterion for educative experience. Dewey (1938) defines mis-educative experience as any experience "that has the effect of arresting or distorting the growth of further experience" (p. 25) and he divides the qualities of experience into two aspects, "there is an immediate aspect of agreeableness or disagreeableness, and there is its influence upon later experience" (p. 27).

Gadamer (1975) describes how we use the word "experience" in two different senses, "to refer to the experiences that fit in with our expectation and confirm it, and to the experience that we have" (p. 317). He states that the latter kind of experience is always negative, although I prefer the term "unexpected." This unexpected aspect of experience provides opportunities for learning. Bruner (1986) states "surprise is a response to violated presupposition" (p. 46). It is this surprise that can awaken us to making sense of our experience in new ways. Experience that confirms what we already know, expect, take for granted, seldom leads to further insights. It allows us to go on "living as usual" (Schutz, 1970). As Gadamer states, "every experience worthy of the name runs counter to our expectations" (p. 319), and thus forces us to question.

We need to think carefully about the stories we hear and tell for when communal stories are taken for granted, they are accepted as the only right or possible ways to author lives within the community. "The surprises I encounter are most often generated by others violating the usual or doing something 'against the rules'" (Bruner, 1986, p. 47). These surprises can awaken us to making sense of our experience in new ways. Thus, we need to be surprised in order to awaken to new ways of telling and living authorized versions (Connelly & Clandinin, in preparation). Narrative tellings become educative tellings when they open up questions and new possibilities for understanding experience. As Connelly and Clandinin (in preparation) point out:

> The horizons of our knowing shift and change as we awaken to new ways of "seeing" our world, to different ways of seeing ourselves in relation to each other and to the world. We begin to retell our stories with new insights, in new ways. (p. 2)

The notion of lifelong learning that is presently being promoted in education arises from Dewey's description of educative experience. "In a certain sense every experience should do something to prepare a person for later experiences of a deeper and more expansive quality. That is the very meaning of growth, continuity, reconstruction of

experience" (Dewey, 1938, p. 47). Thus, educative experience implies being open and staying open to experience. Dewey explains that it is not only content knowledge that is learned in an educative experience, but attitudes toward learning as well. "The most important attitude that can be formed is that of desire to go on learning" (Dewey, 1938, p. 48). In this sense, one can never get or have an education but only, through educative experience, become more "experienced."

Van Manen (1990) describes "being experienced" as "a wisdom of the practice of living which results from having lived life deeply" (p. 32). Gadamer (1975) describes how what we call "experienced" "does not consist in the fact that someone already knows everything and knows better than anyone else" (p. 319), but rather:

> The experienced person proves to be, on the contrary, someone who is radically undogmatic; who, because of the many experiences he has had and the knowledge he has drawn from them is particularly well equipped to have new experiences and to learn from them. The dialectic of experience has its own fulfilment not in definitive knowledge, but in that openness to experience that is encouraged by experience itself. (p. 319)

The possibilities for becoming experienced in the contexts of teacher education has been a central focus of this inquiry. By attending carefully to the stories teacher education students tell, I have come to better understandings of the ways in which they think about the possibilities of becoming experienced.

Conversation

From a constructivist stance, conversation is an essential form of negotiating meaning (Bruffee, 1986). In order to build a strong community, the language of conversation must be inclusive; it must allow and encourage all voices to be heard.

Gadamer (1975) draws parallels between the qualities required to become experienced and the qualities of conversation, describing how inquiry into experience and inquiry in conversation both have a hermeneutic quest for meaning. In this sense, understanding of experience is inseparable from conversation.

Conversation is inclusive, allowing all participants to share in the negotiation of constructed meaning. Conversation involves all aspects of experience -- cognitive, affective, social, personal, historical, and moral and is thus an expression of individual's personal practical knowledge. Authentic conversation encourages the voicing of personal meaning and can consist of both "a good story" and "a good argument" (Bruner, 1986). However, it is essential that the partners perceive each other as equal persons intent on

increasing understanding rather than displaying their superiority. Van Manen (1977) describes the ideal communication situation as one which "specifies norms and roles of a social situation in such a manner that no repressive dominance, asymmetry, or inequality exists among the participants" (p. 222). For a conversation to remain open to inquiry, this sense of equality is essential. Each person in the conversation must be valued as a person in order to feel safe in sharing subjective views. Each conversation is a disclosure, not only of ideas but of self. It is the person, not his/her knowledge or status that must be valued in order for each person to feel free to give voice to his/her own subjective views.

Barrett (1979) states that "a conversation does not take place inside each other's heads alternately, nor at the surface of our bodies in their overt behavior; it is really in the region between the speakers that the conversation takes place" (p. 184). Because any conversation takes place "in the open," this place must be experienced as safe before a conversation will "take place."

The notion of response is essential in establishing a conversational relationship. A response always comes from a certain orientation. Being able to respond requires that we are able to identify and identify with the other person's orientation, and see the world through his/her eyes. We need to be able to hear the sacred story behind the mundane story being told. We can only be attentive and responsive to those things that exist for us. We call things into existence by naming them, but the ways in which we name them shape the ways in which we respond to them.

Conversation is a dialectical response to a question. The ability to keep the question open is a necessary component of any conversation. As Gadamer (1975) states "the person who knows how to ask questions is able to persist in his questioning, which involves being able to preserve his orientation toward openness. The art of questioning is that of being able to go on asking questions, ie the art of thinking" (p. 330). The conversation ceases when the participants have a sense not of the answer, but rather of something having been fulfilled (Van Manen, 1990). There is also likely a sense of the possibility of further inquiry.

In authentic conversation there is an openness to inquiry. The partners in the conversation show both an interest in the topic being discussed as well as an interest in the other person. Thus, conversation is a means of connecting subjective views of experience that lead to further understanding both of the topic and of the person. Conversation evolves around objects and situations in the world of the participants and leads to shared meaning. As Gitlin (1990) points out, "the questions we ask are never simply our own. Instead, they reflect an ongoing negotiation among the influences of material conditions or contexts, cultural norms, and self" (p. 454). The sharing of subjective views allows us to

hear alternate perspectives that in turn allow us to reshape our sense of meaning. Brimfield, Roderick and Yamamoto (1983) state that "the sharing of subjective views of life expands our horizons by introducing us to new frames of reference" (p. 12).

Conversation is a reflective emerging of meaning; "establishing a conversational relation is a hermeneutic endeavor" (Carson, 1986, p. 7). Conversation allows the opening of possibilities and it expands the horizons of knowing when ideas and stories are shared. As one student expressed to me, "It is the emerging of two contexts," mine and yours, that reflectively influence each other. Thus, conversations provide a process for reflection through which stories are recalled, told, exchanged, retold, told back, and reconstructed. They provide simultaneous connections between people and ideas. Thus, negotiation functions at two levels, one being the topic of conversation, the other being the relationship of the participants.

In the academic world of the university, students construct and reconstruct knowledge through the experiences of talking and listening, reading and writing. Each is filled with possibilities for students to enter into conversation. Tannen (1990) describes ways in which our conversational relationships represent two different modes of knowing. She describes the paradigmatic mode as "report talk" which comes from a position of status and involves telling someone else what you know. The narrative mode involves "rapport talk" where the purpose of the conversation is to understand each other as well as the topic of conversation. In theory construction, individual voices are submerged as we attempt to explain generalizable structures that transcend subjective idiosyncratic contexts. When we construct stories, voice is paramount.

When education is seen as a process of becoming experienced through telling, living, retelling, and reliving our narratives of personal practical knowledge, authorship becomes a crucial issue. Tappan and Brown (1989) suggest

> Authorship not only expresses itself through narrative, it also develops through narrative. This is because when an individual tells a moral story about an experience in his life, he must necessarily *reflect* on that experience. . . . Consequently, such reflection also entails learning from the event narrated, in the sense that the individual has the opportunity to consider what happened, what he thought, felt, and did, and how things turned out. (p. 192)

Thus it becomes crucial to honor the stories individuals choose to tell. When the culturally authorized versions become the stories to strive for, we may shape the telling of our stories to fit these authorized versions. We may "cover over" the lived story by telling what we believe is a more acceptable story, the story we believe others want to hear. I turn now to

the notion of "cover stories" developed by Crites (1979) and discuss their implications for teacher education.

Cover Stories

The canonical nature of stories shape our lives. Crites (1979) uses the term "cover story" to describe stories we tell in order to fit in with what we believe to be the authorized versions in our society. However, the "real" story is the one which is actually lived. He explains

> The story that cannot be faced is the real story, in the sense that it continues to assert itself in motivating one's course of action, with the more acceptable scenario constantly being put forward as a cover story to rationalize the course of action, however awkwardly it may be made to fit. . . . The real story, though never avowed, is the one that is actually believed and acted upon. (p. 126)

We need to adhere to the canonical quality of the stories a community constructs in order to be accepted into the community. When teacher education students find themselves expected to learn to tell stories of teaching and learning which are not part of their personal practical knowledge, they may be faced with a moral dilemma of choosing to tell (and trying to live) a cover story which they believe to be the authorized version of professional practice or of authoring versions which fit with their narrative knowing.

The communally authorized versions become so pervasive that telling and living new versions become difficult. Since telling and living unauthorized versions can lead to severe social consequences, we often silence the stories we feel will not be accepted. When the stories of our personal experience do not seem to fit the authorized versions, we may choose to discount our experience and attempt to live and tell the authorized cover stories.

Gilligan (1991) also alludes to cover stories where girls are subtly persuaded to cover up what they know from their experience and accept a story in which their knowing is disconnected from their experience: "And the wall that keeps memory from seeping through these covers may be the wall with the sign which labels body, feelings, relationships, knowing, voice and desire as bad" (Gilligan, 1991, p. 23).

If we are going to pay attention to the personal practical knowledge individuals construct, we need to make space for all stories to be told. Telling cover stories leads to self-deception (Crites, 1979), feelings of inauthenticity (Brown, 1991), and alienation. As

space is made to tell our stories, we can begin to open up inquiry in ways that may help us live better lives. Telling our stories is the first step in attending carefully to their meanings.

Contexts of Teacher Education

To become a member of a community, we need to learn the stories of that community. We need to be cultivated (Connelly & Clandinin, in preparation) into the authorized stories of the community before we can begin to author new or different stories that will contribute to the reshaping of communal stories. Education students, seeking entry as strangers to the teaching community, become part of the institutional narrative of teacher education both at the university and in the schools. However, as Schutz (1970) tells us:

> From the stranger's point of view . . . the culture of the approached group has its particular history, and this history is even accessible to him. But it has never become an integral part of his biography. . . . At best he may be willing and able to share the present and the future with the approached group in vivid and immediate experience; under all circumstances, however, he remains excluded from such experiences of its past. Seen from the point of view of the approached group, he is a man without a history. (p. 87-88)

Education students become experienced through a variety of situations and relationships in their teacher education programs. University teachers, cooperating teachers, student peers, and students that they themselves will be expected to teach are all part of the context in which education students construct and reconstruct their narrative knowledge of teaching and learning. Each individual the student encounters is authoring his/her own narrative of experience within his/her construction of what education means. Each narrative of experience is constructed within unique but shared contexts and by unique individuals. For example, each cooperating teacher constructs and reconstructs his/her narrative of experience within a context different from each university teacher and each teacher education student. Each individual focuses attention on different kinds of experience, values different kinds of knowledge, and encourages different kinds of teacher-student relationships depending upon the moral stance of his/her own personal narrative. To add to the complexity, teacher education takes place in institutional contexts that are embedded within historical traditions based on socio-cultural views that shape epistemological orientations. Because these institutional contexts are also continuous and interactive, they can be thought of as institutional narratives that both shape and are shaped by individuals and other institutional contexts.

Apprenticeship, inquiry, and technical versions of teacher education have evolved from historical beginnings in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. These versions have become sacred stories embedded within present teacher education institutions and they implicitly shape the ways in which individuals construct their unique narratives of experience.

The apprenticeship approach described by Dewey valued "imitation of model behavior, mastery of essential skills, and acceptance of routine procedures as the basis of action" (Patterson, 1983, p. 6). This approach was prevalent in the normal schools where the focus was on issues of how to teach, with academic courses offered "so that teachers would be familiar with what they would be teaching in the schools" (Urban, 1990, p. 61). The apprenticeship approach values the transmission of practical knowledge from those who know to those who do not and it is a prevalent way of constructing knowledge about teaching. The intention becomes one in which the novice is expected to learn from the experts who have the position of status since they have "more" experience. In this version, experience is seen as a body of practical knowledge which can be transmitted to others to practice. This is a story of practice makes perfect.

Patterson (1983) describes the normal school as reinforcing the apprenticeship model of teaching and states that "the influence of the normal school has been pervasive and in harmony with maintaining the status quo" (p. 3). Patterson also points out how the partnerships among the normal schools, the public schools, and the Department of Education in Alberta "maintained a close working relationship and reinforced a commonly held view of teaching and teacher preparation" (p. 18).

The ways in which emerging universities in America were shaped by the "intellectual hegemony of Positivism" (Schon, 1983, p. 34) during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries led to technical rationalism as a sacred story of professional education. Faculties of Education soon became part of these institutions, drawing needed clientele to the universities. Because their graduates were seen as better, that is, more scientifically educated, they provided competition for the normal schools. The tensions between practical relevance and theoretical abstraction are played out in present institutional narratives both within universities and between universities and schools. However, both are versions of knowledge as hierarchically constructed where getting an education involves the accumulation of theory and practice.

Dewey's notion of the laboratory school is foundational to the inquiry orientation in teacher education. Patterson (1983) describes this orientation as involving "problem identification, intelligent judgment, and imaginative application of knowledge with appropriate ensuing analysis and evaluation, the results of which influence subsequent

behavior" (p. 6). In this version, experience is always open to reconstruction as we tell, live, retell, and relive stories of educative practice. It is a story of becoming more experienced through constructing and reconstructing what we know. Even as Dewey (1938) emphasized the importance of learning through experience as well as the integral nature of the knower and the known, graduate programs were moving toward the use of statistical surveys to create a body of knowledge to legitimate educational decisions made by administrators. The pervasiveness of positivism as a means of abstracting generalizable objective theories about teaching soon became the dominant sacred story of technical rationalism.

Moving the focus of teacher education away from schools and teachers, created a rift between the teacher education institutions and the schools which is still pervasive today. The scientific nature of teacher education split theory from practice. The search for generalizable theories about teaching decontextualized teacher education and technical rationalism became valued over practical knowledge in the training of teachers. The hierarchical nature of the institutional structure reflected the hierarchical epistemology of positivism. The emphasis on scientific rigor as having more status than practical application led to the "denigration of the school classroom as the appropriate focus of educational study" (Urban, p. 64).

As more women moved into teaching positions, men lived a sacred story of gender roles and moved up in the educational hierarchy (Patterson, 1986; Urban, 1990), becoming administrators or teacher educators. Patterson (1986) points out that "growth of professional commitment and responsibility among teachers was retarded by the obvious depreciation of the role of teacher and by the society's failure to give women teachers equal place with their male counterparts" (p. 14).

Normal schools, "seeking their proper position in the educational hierarchy" (Urban, p. 65), became colleges, often hiring their faculty members from the universities. These faculty members "did not honor the purpose of preparing teachers as the ultimate goal of their work. Instead, they pushed to get students to major in their subjects" (Urban, p. 65). This led graduates to value the authority of the body of subject area knowledge they acquired more than the authority of experiential knowledge they developed in relationships with students.

Educational institutions imbued with the values of objective positivism, have continually embarked on a path of academic inflation where "institutions come to imitate those above them in the hierarchy" (Urban, p. 66). The body of theoretical knowledge gained status as the measure of competence and knowledge constructed through experience was seen as too subjective and nonrigorous to be taken seriously into account.

While the sacred story of technical rationalism has been questioned (Schon, 1983), the hierarchical organization built up by the epistemology of positivism leaves little space for other stories to be heard. At present, the sacred stories of apprenticeship, technical rationalism and inquiry are tacitly interwoven and lived out in individual's practices within the contexts of teacher education. Education students must author their own narratives of experience within these implicit sacred stories.

Education students need to develop relationships with, and to be evaluated by, individuals who are living different narrative constructions of teacher education. These narratives are tacitly lived out in practice rather than spoken about. Not only are students evaluated as learners but as teachers as well, based on the particular narratives that are authored by their cooperating teachers and university teachers. When different sacred stories are being lived, the resonance of meaning necessary for understanding is not present. As student-teachers, they need to develop pedagogical relationships with their students while at the same time they need to negotiate meaning with their cooperating teacher and faculty consultant. Guyton and McIntyre (1990) point out that in the typical triad of student teacher, cooperating teacher, and university teacher there is seldom agreement regarding expectations, roles, and responsibilities. If the mundane stories that these individuals tell point to different sacred stories, collaborative negotiation and construction of meaning is not possible.

Exploring the ways in which education students author stories of teaching and learning within the complex interactive network of narrative constructions they experience can open possibilities for students, teachers, and teacher educators to come to new understandings of the stories we learn to live and tell about teaching and teacher education. Becoming more aware of the sacred stories that are pointed to in the mundane stories that are told can help us tell and live more collaborative stories as an educational community.

Contexts of the Research

In the present inquiry, I worked with two preservice education students during the professional year of their programs. I acknowledge that the students I worked with came to their programs with their own images of teaching and learning embedded in their personal practical knowledge. I pay attention to the ways in which these students' personal practical knowledge of good teaching shaped and was shaped by their experiences in the contexts of their university classrooms and school classrooms during their teacher education programs.

I have tried to make space for the stories they chose to tell. As they told me stories which expressed their personal practical knowledge of teaching and learning, I paid close attention and took their stories seriously. I listened for the sacred stories embedded in the mundane stories and have begun to understand the tensions involved as they authored their own stories of good teaching while at the same time they were required to conform to authorized versions of good teaching constructed by others.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

> Explanations settle issues, showing that matters must end as they have. Narratives raise issues, showing that matters do not end as they must but as they do. Explanation sets the need for further inquiry aside; narrative invites us to rethink what we thought we knew.
>
> (James Carse, 1986, p. 125)

Narrative Inquiry

In this chapter, I describe my understanding of narrative inquiry. I then move on to tell my story of Zach, Susan, and me working together.

Narrative inquiry focuses on the storied nature of human experience. The stories people author, which are individually continuous and socially interactive, are one of the most common ways individuals use to express their personal practical knowledge of experience to themselves and others. Thus narrative inquiry provides both the source of information through the stories as well as the method of interpretation and reinterpretation of experience. I use Connelly and Clandinin's (1990) distinction of the phenomenon as "story" and the inquiry as "narrative." Clandinin and Connelly (1990) describe the holistic nature of narrative in the following way:

> The narrative study of experience brings body to mind and mind to body; it connects autobiography to action and an intentional future; it connects these to social history and direction; and it links the pluralistic extremes of formalism to the concreteness of specific actions. (p. 245)

Stories are told in ordinary language, the language of experience (Barrett, 1979). Because stories are a holistic expression of experience told spontaneously, they provide a rich source for beginning to explore the ways in which individuals construct and reconstruct personal practical knowledge. These stories provide texts for hermeneutic exploration. These texts may take the form of conversations, field texts constructed in situations, letters, journals, or other representations of meaning such as written documents and photographs. We tell our stories in many ways.

Narrative has the temporal quality of lived experience (Bruner, 1987) as past memories and future intentions are played out in present action. Because we live storied lives, we are at the same time living our stories and telling stories of our experience to ourselves and others. We also tell stories of others in ways that may help us figure out our

own stories. We tell stories we have already lived as well as stories of the way we hope to live. The complexity of narrative inquiry becomes apparent when it is understood that each of us is authoring his/her own life while at the same time being a character in the lives authored by others. Thus, the stories we author tell of our relationships with others.

Stories are told from the perspective of the storyteller and thus provide information about his/her stance in the world (Bruner, 1987). By exploring the storied nature of experience, we come to better understandings of the ways in which individuals construct unique personal practical knowledge about the world as well as the tensions involved in the social actions continuously taking place.

The stories we author contain implicit moral dimensions (Tappan & Brown, 1989) that express the storyteller's values and justify his/her actions within a social context (Bruner, 1986). In our stories we account for our actions as well as ask others to account for theirs. Thus, stories point to our individual beliefs as well as the socially and culturally accepted beliefs into which we have been born. The sacred nature of these communal and anonymous stories provide powerful implicit constructions of the way the world is and how lives should be lived within that world. Thus, if our lives do not fit the versions apparently authorized within our community, it becomes difficult to publicly share our stories and even more difficult to have them heard. We may choose to tell a cover story we believe will be more acceptable than the story we live.

Stories also provide tacit questions for exploration. By naming previously implicit stories, we uncover previously taken for granted assumptions which may lead to new ways to think about living our lives. Clandinin and Connelly (in press) tell us "difficult as it may be to tell a story, the more difficult but important task in narrative is the retelling of stories that allow for growth and change."

We learn to live our lives as we construct and reconstruct stories based on stories we have told and heard. Thus, who tells and who gets listened to become crucial issues. For me, the questions "Who gets to speak?" and "Who gets listened to?" become a question of "Who authors the stories we choose to live by?"

The ways in which our stories are given back to us by others can lead us to new understandings and new ways to author our lives (Clandinin, 1991). Stories are constructed for an audience, whether self or others, and this audience influences both the stories one chooses to tell as well as the manner of telling (Clark, 1993b).

The Inquiry Unfolds

Beginning the Inquiry: Developing Relationships

Connelly and Clandinin (1990) point out "the necessity of time, relationship, space, and voice in establishing the collaborative relationship" (p. 4) for narrative inquiry. My research concerns grew out of the relationships I had developed with several undergraduate students over my past five years as a graduate student in a large midwestern Canadian university. This university has more than nine hundred full-time and part-time graduate students enrolled in education masters' and doctoral degrees as well as diploma programs. The Faculty of Education is divided into six departments: Educational Administration, Educational Psychology, Adult and Career Technology, Educational Foundations, Secondary Education, and Elementary Education. More than two thousand students are enrolled in preservice teacher education programs. Students wanting to become classroom teachers focus on an elementary route (supervised by Elementary Education) or a secondary route (supervised by Secondary Education) and are required to take courses from other departments as well as from other faculties at the university. Practicum placements are under the direction of the Department of Field Services. University teachers continually struggle with trying to develop a sense of caring and community within such a large institutional context.

I first met Zach and Susan, the two teacher education students who became part of this inquiry, in January, 1991. Ever since I returned to university to begin my master's degree, I have worked at a table in the lounge (one of the few places where I have found a sense of community within the Education Building). I first met Zach at one of these tables. The room was crowded and he asked if he could join me at my table. He said he would not talk. He had a book to finish reading and he could see I was busy too. The next day I met him again as a student in a preservice education course I was teaching. Susan was also in this class. After our first class, I noticed her at a table in the lounge and stopped to talk to her.

In the official institutional classroom story, I was the teacher; they were the students. Out of class, Zach, Susan and I (and other students as well) spent time together telling what I now name "figuring out good teaching" stories. As we shared our stories in conversation we tried to figure out what good teaching might involve. I did not realize at the time that what we were doing was living a good teaching and learning story. As we constructed and reconstructed our knowing of good teaching through the stories we told, gave back to each other in new ways, and learned to retell, we came to better understandings of teaching, ourselves, and each other. We were each a

teacher/learner/researcher. Although these "storytimes" (Crites, 1986) did not count for credit, they seemed important. Otherwise, why were we spending so much time just talking?

At this time I was also authoring my life as a doctoral student beginning to formulate a research question for my dissertation. I knew I wanted to work with preservice teachers. I wanted to understand more of how they understood teaching and learning. I was fascinated by their stories. I decided to shape my research as a narrative inquiry with preservice students to try to figure out how they constructed and reconstructed meaning about teaching and learning within the contexts of their university courses and practicum experiences.

I had begun writing my research proposal in April, 1991 and knew I wanted to work with students during their professional year when they would be taking teaching methods courses at the university as well as going out to schools to do their practica. I wanted to understand more about the connections and disjunctions students might experience among the personal practical knowledge they brought to their programs, their experiences in university classes, and their experiences in their practica placements. The criterion for selecting students to become part of this inquiry was not one of whether or not they were representative of the student population in general, but rather whether or not they were willing to spend time sharing their stories with me and were interested in examining how they construct and reconstruct meaning as they engaged in the curriculum of teacher education. Although my official teacher/student relationship with Zach and Susan ended early in April, 1991, we continued to carry on our conversations. These conversations led me to ask them if they would like to participate in this inquiry.

Coming to Know Zach and Susan

Zach was enrolled in the secondary route and had chosen Social Studies as his major and French as his minor. His Social Studies and French courses were taken in other faculties while his Teaching Methods courses in these subject areas were taken in the Department of Secondary Education. Through our conversations, Zach shared with me his hopes of becoming a secondary school Social Studies teacher. He was intrigued by history, old architecture, social relationships and individual rights. He valued being able to fit into a variety of situations from ballroom dancing to horse back riding. He was intrigued by the cultural diversity he had experienced in Europe and Quebec. Zach had worked in a variety of situations, including the military, before returning to school in his midtwenties, first enrolling at a community college, and now pursuing a degree in education at the university. He seemed like a good listener who respected the views of

others and expressed his views in an open and authentic manner. He seemed calm and methodical.

Susan was enrolled in the elementary route. Having chosen Special Education as her teaching focus placed her at the juncture of the departments of Elementary Education and Educational Psychology. Susan had worked at a variety of jobs since graduating from high school. The jobs in themselves were not particularly appealing; however, Susan began to realize what she did enjoy were the relationships she was able to develop with clients and customers. Helping them meet their needs gave Susan a sense of achievement. Susan returned to school in her early twenties, first enrolling in a Bachelor of Science program and then transferring to the Faculty of Education. Her younger brother's experiences of difficulties in school had touched and disturbed her. She hoped to become a Special Education teacher of children in elementary school in order to help others like her brother. Filled with questions and a ready sense of humor, Susan seemed vivacious and enthusiastic.

Inviting Zach and Susan to Participate

While I was struggling to write my research proposal, Zach was taking a spring session course. Susan had left the university for her summer job and would not return until September, 1991. During this time Zach and I spent many hours talking over his coursework and my proposal. While I knew at this time that I wanted to invite him to participate, I felt I could not ask until I had a clearer sense of what I wanted to do. Negotiating entry would involve discussing the proposed research with the participants, making them as aware as possible of both substantive and methodological issues. I knew they would have to give me informed consent. Since the purpose of my inquiry was exploration, I did not know what lay ahead. At one point I told Zach I felt like I was jumping off a cliff. He said, "So build yourself a kite." I began to think of my proposal as a kite -- a frame to catch the wind, similar to Schutz's (1970) "net of reflection."

I initially hoped to work with three students. I wanted the depth I felt could come from different perspectives. I felt working with two students could lead to a sense of bipolarity. I had asked Zach if I could tape record one of our conversations in order to get a sense of how the research might actually proceed. When I transcribed the conversation, I began to realize how long this would take -- eight hours transcription time for each hour of recorded conversation. I also began to realize how rich the conversation was. When I thought about the amount of time I wanted to spend with each participant, and the amount of time we would need to spend to explore their experiences in depth, I realized working

with three people would not be possible for me. I decided to ask Zach and Susan if they would like to participate.

Even when my proposal framework was completed, I knew I could not really get informed consent. Since the narrative inquiry experience would be one where they would be asked to inquire into their own experience, I had no idea of what might emerge in the study. How could I help the participants be aware of the possible risks involved? I did not realize at this time that no matter how well I could or could not inform them of possible consequences, this was not nearly as essential as the trusting relationship we had already developed.

When I finally asked Zach if he would like to participate, he agreed. I described as best I knew how I thought the process might work and explained he could choose to withdraw at any time. I also explained that since the final research document would contain portions of the conversations, he would be consulted before the material was shared publicly and would have the right to request removal of any conversation transcript he felt uncomfortable in sharing. Also, any interpretations I made would be shared and negotiated with him throughout the study and would only be shared publicly when he agreed. I also gave him a copy of my proposal to read as well as copies of articles I had written from other research studies. Once I had done this, I called Susan at home and invited her to participate as well. When she agreed, I met her at her house, explained what I planned to do, and also gave her copies of the previous articles I had written.

Negotiation and Ethical Considerations

Negotiation and ethical considerations were intertwined and embedded throughout the research. Because the sharing of subjective views entails self-disclosure, ethical considerations were integral throughout the study. Because of the centrality of Zach's and Susan's constructions of meaning, their psychological well-being was a primary consideration. An atmosphere of trust between the students and myself was necessary. In order for students to be willing to share their stories openly, they needed to know that I valued what they had to say. Because I valued their stories, I took them seriously (Clark, 1993b; Brown, 1991). Since I valued my relationship with Zach and Susan as persons more than as research subjects, bonds involving friendship and sharing were built which have continued past the research project.

The ways in which we come to understand ourselves and the situations in which we interact can only develop in safe spaces. Zach and Susan needed to know their views could be expressed safely. For me, it was crucial to honor their stories, to play what

Elbow (1981) calls "the believing game" in order to create spaces where Zach and Susan would feel able to tell and retell their stories. It was important to attend to Zach's and Susan's stories in an accepting, nonjudgmental manner but not in a way that silenced my own voice.

I initially believed anonymity could be provided by changing the students' names in the study. Anonymity proved to be a much more complex issue as the inquiry progressed. Since the stories Zach and Susan authored contained many other characters, these people unknowingly became part of the narrative accounts. Their names have all been changed as well; however, at times, this was not enough. This was less problematic in Zach's stories since he often spoke in generalized abstractions. Susan's stories were filled with vivid descriptions of particular people in particular situations. Since Zach's and Susan's constructions of meaning were the focus of this study, I wanted to include their storying of their relationships with others while at the same time providing anonymity within the narrative particularities. This became a validity consideration as well as an ethical one. I chose to "fictionalize" (Oakley, 1984) the characters at times by changing gender as well as names. I also changed or deleted the names of some of the settings in which the stories took place.

Confidentiality could not be promised since I planned on using excerpts from the conversation transcripts as a major part of the final document. I told both Zach and Susan I would not include any parts which they did not feel comfortable in sharing publicly.

In the following sections I describe in more detail the kinds of negotiation which took place throughout the study. These negotiations were ethical issues as well as I continuously kept in mind that I was inquiring into the lives of two friends.

Representing the Experience as Text

Experience may be represented in a variety of ways including narrative texts which may take the form of field notes, journal records, conversations, story telling, letter writing, autobiographical and biographical writing, as well as other textual sources (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990). In the following sections I describe why stories told in conversation became the main form of narrative text in the present inquiry, how other textual sources became included within our conversations, and how our conversations were shaped by our narratives of experience in relation to each other and our particular situations within the contexts of teacher education.

Choosing Conversation

I chose to begin the inquiry by continuing the conversations in which we were already engaged. Encouraging Zach and Susan to tell me stories of what was important to them would allow the research to be grounded in their experience and would provide ideas for what other types of data might be useful.

I initially felt journal writing might provide a way to supplement our conversations. However, I did not ask Zach or Susan to write for me. They seemed to be overwhelmed by the assigned readings and written assignments without my adding to their load. I had also imagined if either Zach or Susan was keeping a journal as a coursework requirement, it could provide possibilities for inquiry. This did happen when both Zach and Susan shared with me the journals they were required to keep during their practica. While what they wrote for their assigned journals was constructed for their instructors, I felt this provided a valuable way to explore how they were constructing meaning within the context of their programs rather than outside their programs which would have been the case in writing a journal with me.

I also felt the ways in which Zach and Susan negotiated and constructed meaning through their coursework assignments might provide valuable data sources. During the research process, these were often the focus of our conversations as Zach and Susan shared the process of constructing their assignments. I imagined university and school documents such as course outlines, the calendar, forms, student teaching evaluations, and practica handbooks might also be useful in exploring the negotiation of meaning between institutional and individual stories. Again, these all came up in our conversations. The assignments and documents themselves did not become part of the field texts I collected. Rather, Zach's and Susan's stories of these assignments and documents became part of our conversations.

Collection of fieldnotes through participant observation in university classes and student teaching placements, while seen as possibilities during the writing of the research proposal, did not seem appropriate to the inquiry. Since I was not interested in verifying an objective truth, but rather in understanding the meanings Zach and Susan constructed and reconstructed from their experiences, their voices, rather than the visual metaphor of objective positivism implicit in observation, have been of central importance.

In our literate society, written visible text claims more authority than the audible text of conversation (Ong, 1982). Thus, conversation is often discounted as just talking. The work of Belenky et al. (1986) provides a constructivist perspective for exploring knowing as the development of self, voice, and mind. This perspective provides a metaphor for exploring knowing that is different from the visual metaphor identified with

objective positivism. "Sight isolates, sound incorporates" (Ong, 1982, p. 72). The visual metaphor of objective positivism "inherent and unavoidable in cognitive thought, accounts for the fact that so much of what we normally say about knowledge, scholarship, research, and college or university instruction is confined within a frustrating circularity oscillating between 'outer' and 'inner' poles of 'objectivity' and 'subjectivity'" (Bruffee, 1986, p. 776). Belenky et al. (1986) compare the visual metaphor to "a camera passively recording a static reality" (p. 18) with the accompanying notion that "disengagement and objectification are central to the construction of knowledge" (p. 18). The metaphor of voice provides a very different way of knowing. "Unlike the eye, the ear operates by registering nearby subtle changes. Unlike seeing, speaking and listening suggest dialogue and interaction" (p. 18). This metaphor implies the centrality of the research relationship in which all persons involved speak and listen to each other in order to attend carefully to the meanings that are being constructed and reconstructed from experience. Ong (1982) points out the unobtrusive connection voice allows.

> Because of its physical constitution as sound, the spoken word proceeds from the human interior and manifests human beings to one another as conscious interiors, as persons, the spoken word forms human beings into close-knit groups. (p.74)

Since I wanted to understand how Zach and Susan constructed meaning from their experiences, their stories were what I wanted to hear. Thus, what they chose to say and the ways in which they chose to tell their stories of their experiences were the focus of this inquiry. Others who shared these experiences with Zach and Susan, including peers, university teachers, cooperating teachers, and students, would story them differently. Zach and Susan might also choose to story their experiences differently with someone else and at different times in their lives.

The Research Conversations

While the primary source of textual material for the research came from the research conversations, these were also informed by the many other conversations we had during the research period. I did keep a notebook with me during the first two months of our research where I would write down fragments of our casual conversations. However, the information was becoming overwhelming. I found almost everything they said interested me. During one conversation, Zach laughed and said, "I'm not going to talk to you anymore. I make too much work for you!" I began to realize I was trying to "capture it all" as if there was a finite body of knowledge I could capture. Zach wisely told me, "If

it's important, it will come up again." While I decided to frame the research within the research conversations, our other conversations provided a holistic understanding surrounding the research conversations. They provide one of the contexts in which the research conversations are embedded.

Zach and I talked almost every day; Susan and I less frequently. The frequency of our conversations can be understood as expressions of our personal practical knowledge. One way Zach enacted his personal practical knowledge was through the image of "life as a path." Moving from one step to the next enabled Zach to focus on one thing (and one person) at a time. Our daily conversations became part of a cyclical rhythm which was seldom interrupted. Susan lived her "life as a web" image in her multiple and simultaneous relationships. Her coursework and our research conversations were not her only commitments. Each week Susan struggled to juggle home, family, friends, university assignments and student council commitments along with our research as well as finding time for herself. Susan set priorities moment by moment based on the needs of herself and others. Our conversations were part of this web of relationships and often included other friends.

We had initially planned to tape biweekly conversations throughout the year. We agreed that I would transcribe our conversations and give them a copy to read over before our next research conversation two weeks later. At times this worked. Since I believed Zach's and Susan's commitments to their coursework were of primary importance, our research conversations were scheduled around their time constraints and commitments whenever necessary. I did not want the research to be experienced as an imposition, but rather as an opportunity for sharing and making sense of their experiences. I worked separately with Zach and Susan. Lists of the dates of these transcribed research conversations appear in Appendix A (Zach) and Appendix B (Susan).

We chose to tape our research conversations in the lounge at a table since this was where we always had conversations about teaching and I wanted the research conversations to be an extension of the conversations I was already finding fascinating. Even though I had conversations with others about how the setting can change the conversation, I persisted in taping at these tables in the lounge. I had always enjoyed working in this space; it was the space where my research interests began. I have met many people at these tables. It is a very different kind of space from anywhere else in the Education Building. It is a place for mingling. It is a middle ground (Clandinin et al., 1993) where professors, students, support staff, and others can get to know each other. It is a place where the professional and personal come together. Talking with Lori Neilson and students taking her graduate course, "The Academy of the Kitchen Table" during the

Summer Institute 1992 sponsored by the Centre for Research for Teacher Education and Development at the University helped me understand these tables in this new way.

Zach and I always met at the tables in the lounge. We both did most of our work here. Zach attended the University Dance Club two evenings a week so even during his practicum, we met in the lounge. Susan and I often met at these tables, but we also met in her home. Her student council activities as well as her multiple commitments kept her busy. In the lounge she was often sitting with a variety of friends. During her practicum, I went to her home for our research conversations.

Collaborative Stories

Since Zach's and Susan's stories of their experience were the focus of the inquiry, I followed their lead and listened carefully to their stories. By providing space for Zach and Susan to voice their ideas, I felt what was meaningful for them would emerge. Whatever they chose to talk about was what I wanted to hear. I wanted to "flexibly shape" the research process rather than "rigidly cripple" it (Barrett, 1979). However, since the responses I gave back to Zach and Susan were shaped by my own narrative of experience which in turn shaped the stories they subsequently told, our stories became "collaborative stories" (Connelly and Clandinin, 1990) which were mutually shaped and reshaped through our relationships with each other and the particular narrative knowledge we each expressed. As Connelly and Clandinin (1990) state, "the two narratives of participant and researcher become, in part, a shared narrative construction and reconstruction through the inquiry" (p. 5).

My intent in using narrative inquiry as my research method was to capture the ways in which Zach and Susan constructed and reconstructed meaning during their teacher education programs. I had intended to hear stories from Zach and Susan and then take these stories back in order to explore the meanings that had been constructed as well as to explore new ways in which these stories could be reconstructed. This was not the way our research progressed.

While I had hoped to collect stories from Zach and Susan and then involve them in looking more closely at the sacred stories implicit in the mundane stories they had told, this seldom happened. Two things worked against focusing on underlying assumptions and the reconstruction of new stories. The first was the speed with which Zach and Susan needed to assimilate the material they were being presented in their classes as well as the pressure to complete the assignments they were required to construct. Each time we met, there were new stories to tell. The pace of their university curriculum led to a sense of covering the curriculum rather then exploring underlying assumptions. They were living a

story of presenting what they did know in their assignments which conflicted with the research story I was trying to live of constructing and reconstructing knowledge. Zach and Susan were living their stories of teacher education in the "vivid present" (Schutz, 1970) while I was in the position of capturing their stories in a "net of reflection" (Schutz, 1970). I was looking back and they were continually moving forward.

The second thing that worked against exploring their stories was the underlying sacred story of knowledge as certain and unchanging. Both Zach and Susan felt they needed to know what they were doing if they were going to be teachers. Living a story of uncertainty went against what they believed about teachers being knowledgeable professionals. They also were trying to construct their own narrative knowledge of teaching and learning from the materials being presented by their professors. They were trying to learn and make sense of the authorized versions of teaching they were being presented by their professors. Since each professor had different authorized versions, both Zach and Susan were trying to figure out how they were expected to construct assignments in each course for different professors to be presented for evaluation by those professors. They were already feeling confused and vulnerable as they tried to integrate the various versions in order to construct a story of teaching and learning which would make sense to them and still fit with what they believed each professor required. I felt very hesitant in encouraging them to question the underlying assumptions of the assignments they were required to produce when I was not the person who would evaluate their production. Instead, I listened to how Zach and Susan were trying to make sense of the often contradictory material with which they were presented. As well, both Zach and Susan wanted to develop a sense of certainty in order to develop the confidence they wanted to have in their practica experiences. My research story of narrative inquiry was a story of questioning and uncertainty where everything could be open for reinterpretation and reconstruction. This was not the story Zach and Susan were living in the institutional story of answers, certainty, planning, objectives and expectations.

Multiple Levels of Interpretation

In this section I explicitly state the ways in which a variety of subjective interpretations developed through the research process. As Mishler (1990) states, "a context-based explication is required of how observations are transformed into data and findings and how interpretations are grounded" (p. 423). Narrative inquiry involves multiple levels of interpretation. Connelly and Clandinin (1990) describe the complexity as

> one in which we are continually trying to give an account of the multiple levels (which are temporally continuous and socially interactive) at which the inquiry proceeds. The central task is evident when it is grasped that people are both living their stories in an ongoing experiential text and telling their stories in words as they reflect upon life and explain themselves to others. (p. 4)

These multiple levels, which were simultaneously being constructed and reconstructed by Zach, Susan, and myself during the inquiry process (as well as by everyone all the time), were recursive rather than linear. In the following sections, I describe several levels of interpretation which emerged through the research process. These, too, were often taking place simultaneously and were recursive, each level shaping the others. Each reader will also construct interpretations shaped by his or her personal practical knowledge.

Stories as Field Texts of Experience

The stories Zach and Susan chose to tell were already interpretations of their experiences. The ways in which we construct meaning and tell stories of our experience both illuminate and distort, containing self-disclosure and self-deception (Crites, 1979). Ong (1982) tells us "Nature states no 'facts': these come only within statements devised by human beings to refer to the seamless web of actuality around them" (p. 68). The stories they chose to tell me, and the ways in which they told them, were shaped by our relationship. Perhaps they would have told different stories in different ways to different listeners. As I listened to their stories, I understood them through my own personal practical knowing. Schutz (1970) describes how we can only come to an approximate understanding of another person's knowing because "we can only interpret lived experiences belonging to other people in terms of our own lived experiences of them" (p. 170). During our research conversations, I, too, told stories or gave back stories Zach and Susan told me from my own personal practical knowing. Thus, the research conversations were already one level of interpretation and reinterpretation of experience.

From Oral Field Texts to Written Field Texts

Ong (1982) tells us "writing restructures consciousness" (p. 78). Thus, the transcriptions became another reconstruction of our stories. Once I had transcribed our conversations, they became textual artifacts of our oral collaborative stories. Moving from our oral research conversations to written text was a move from the "oral-aural world to a world of visualized pages" (Ong, p. 74). Our spoken words became disembodied visual objects which could be looked at and read again and again. "The spoken word is always an event, a movement in time, completely lacking in the thing-like repose of the written or

printed word" (Ong, 1982, p. 75). Being able to capture our conversations in print both took something away and added a new dimension. Participating in a conversation involves more than the words spoken. Much of the meaning is expressed through body language, pauses, intonation, and emphasis to name a few nuances of oral expression. These are lost in the translation from oral to written text. At the same time, capturing the words of the conversation helps me remember more clearly what our conversations in the past were like as we moved on to new stories and new constructions of meaning. Seeing the words enabled me to step out of the ongoing flow of our oral conversations and recreate the meanings we had constructed from a different perspective. Written text always falls short in representing experience while at the same time enabling us to represent experience (in a limited way) in a form that can be preserved and shared with others.

> The paradox lies in the fact that the deadness of the text, its removal from the living human lifeworld, its rigid visual fixity, assures its endurance and its potential for being resurrected into limitless living contexts by a potentially infinite number of living readers. (Ong, 1982, p. 81)

The stories I share in this research are stories of Zach and Susan over a particular period of time between April, 1991 and December 1992. The research text ends, but their lives do not. Zach and Susan continue to change as they now gain experience as practicing teachers. They will continue to change and so will I. A year from now we would each have different stories to tell and would each bring different interpretations to those stories. The paradigmatic nature of written text appears to capture a static reality. Zach's and Susan's and my lives are ongoing narratives continually being reconstructed as we encouter new experiences. What is presented in this research text, then, is a narrative history taken from a particular perspective at a particular point in time.

From Field Text to Interpretive Field Text

As I spent more time in conversations with Zach and Susan, and countless hours transcribing, reading and rereading the transcripts, I was amazed at how differently Zach and Susan constructed their knowing. I was also amazed at how pervasive their constructions were. Their constructions of teaching and learning were embedded within their holistic constructions of the world. I began to search the field texts for recurring narrative threads. I selected excerpts from our transcribed conversations that I felt could illuminate narrative threads which were representative of Zach's and Susan's experiences. At this stage, interpretation was a matter of selecting what to include and what to exclude. The interpretive field texts remained "close-to-experience" (Clandinin and Connelly, in

press). They were descriptive and were shaped by the particular events (Clandinin and Connelly, in press) Zach and Susan had shared with me. These were written to Zach and Susan. An excerpt from the interpretive field texts I wrote for Zach is presented in Appendix C. An excerpt from the interpretive field text I wrote for Susan is presented in Appendix D.

Since a central focus of this study was how students' interpretations changed over time, "instead of assuming a past reality as a criterion, a potential warrant for the validity of my interpretation is whether it makes sense to the respondent" (Mishler, 1990, p. 427). Both Zach and Susan read these texts and responded to them. Zach read them as literal accounts and viewed them as correct and accurate. He commented that as he read them, he could "see his life unfolding." Susan remarked "that's exactly what my experience was like." She also commented that the meaning was not in the words captured in the research conversations, but rather the meaning was shaped by the situations she experienced.

Connelly and Clandinin (in press) tell us "teacher education is a sustained conversation in which we need many responses to our stories in order to be able to tell and retell them with added possibility." Having others read the emerging constructions throughout the research process contributed to further insights and gave fresh perspectives to pursue. Janice Huber, Nophanet Dhamborvorn, and Cheryl Craig, graduate students who shared space and time with me at the Centre for Research for Teacher Education and Development, were particularly willing to respond to my written and oral constructions and reconstructions. As well, I was able to share both methodological and substantive issues with others who joined us at the Kitchen Table of our weekly research group in the Centre.

From Interpretive Field Text to Research Text

Another level of interpretation occurred when I moved out of the collaborative relationship to "move beyond the telling of the lived story to tell the research story" (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990, p. 10). Each story Zach and Susan told me was embedded within the contextual complexities of their experience. Because of the complex nature of experience, the "whole story" can never be told. This made the writing extremely difficult for me as each story led me to what Clark (1993b) describes as "trap doors, secret gardens, and hidden staircases." Choices were made throughout the research process as to which stories were most "telling" of the students' experience. These stories provide examples from which "we learn something essentially human by understanding an actual life or community as lived" (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990, p. 8).

As I began to move to the writing of the research text, the form was greatly influenced by the narrative forms of Zach's and Susan's experience. Zach had described

his experience of his program as "chaptered." There was a strong linear plot line which fit with Zach's images of "life as a path" and the importance of "moving on" and "making it happen." Connection through continuity was paramount. I chose to present the research text of Zach's story in a way which would be consistent with these linear images. Thus, the research text is constructed as two parallel books, one focusing on the stories Zach heard and learned to tell, the other focusing on the stories Zach learned to live in order to "make it happen."

Susan's experience was a different story. For her, connection through interaction was paramount. My sense of her experiences was one of a series of disconnected episodes which left her feeling she was not progressing the way she felt she should. I divided the research text into three sections which corresponded with the three terms we worked together, each containing episodes grouped under three themes. I had not discussed these divisions with Susan, but I was later intrigued when Susan and I were discussing a paper she was writing. She was struggling to weave together three perspectives on child abuse and to structure them into the linear format she felt she was required to use. When I asked her if it might help to focus on only two of the perspectives, she replied, "I usually like to work with three in a paper. Three seems more complete." Her words seemed a confirmation of my writing.

Writing the research text for Susan's story seemed more difficult than the writing for Zach's story. Zach's seemed like a more straight-forward story. His focus on "making it happen" and "moving on" provided the temporal action necessary in narrative text (Chatman, 1990). As I wrote the research text of Susan's story, it felt heavy and lacking in movement and action. At first I was frustrated with my writing. As I referred to Chatman (1990), I began to realize the writing was more descriptive than narrative. I began to think of the action necessary in narrative text and realized that this was exactly what Susan had complained was missing from her experience in her program. The frustration I was experiencing in the writing was a reflection of the frustration Susan had experienced in her program as she felt "nothing was happening." The narrative authority she wanted was lacking, leaving her feeling she "had no control over what was happening." The theoretical descriptions she was receiving in her program lacked the narrative contingencies and temporality she knew would exist in classrooms. She was frustrated as well by a sense of "not progressing" the way she had expected. The episodic nature of her experience was not turning out to be the authorized version of progression she felt was the story for which to strive. I experienced these tensions in my writing as I struggled to construct a research text shaped by Susan's narrative knowing.

From Research Text to Readerly Text

Another interpretation occurs when you as reader bring your own personal practical knowledge to the research text. I do not know which particular parts will connect with particular readers in meaningful ways. As Connelly and Clandinin (1990) state, "a reader of a story connects with it by recognizing particulars, by imagining the scenes in which the particulars could occur, and by reconstructing them from remembered associations with similar particulars" (p. 8). My sense of a "readerly" (Elbow, 1981) text is one which will enable you to explore your own trap doors, secret gardens, and hidden staircases with new insights.

My hope is that the research text will enable you to bring new understandings to your relationships with those involved in teacher education and perhaps see those relationships in new ways. I also have an heuristic purpose. Rather than providing conclusions, I hope the text will raise new questions about present practices in teacher education. I hope you will know more not only about Zach and Susan in particular, but, through their stories, become aware of the importance of narrative knowledge within teacher education. While I cannot know what particular meanings you will construct as you read the text I have constructed, I hope the meanings you do construct will help you imagine new possibilities for telling and living stories of teacher education.

CHAPTER FOUR

ZACH'S STORY

I have chosen to construct the following stories of some of the ways in which I saw Zach "learn the choices" he believed were available to him as he constructed and reconstructed his knowing of teaching and learning. I have chosen to present these stories in two parallel books which take place simultaneously. Book One focuses on the stories Zach heard and learned to tell; Book Two focuses on the stories Zach lived. I have decided this format is an appropriate way to represent the year Zach himself divided into chapters.

When I began this research project, I transcribed our research conversations and gave a copy to Zach to read before our next biweekly research conversation. In November, 1991 he was very busy with his practicum and told me to keep the transcripts until the practicum was finished. He then said, "This is a new chapter anyway." I was intrigued by this remark and asked him what he meant. He told me his practicum was a completely different experience from his university courses. He told me the courses were Chapter One; his practicum was Chapter Two. I then asked what we should call the time we had worked together before Chapter One had started in September. We decided it was the Prelude to our work. When Zach returned to university in January, 1992 to begin a new term, I asked him if we were in Chapter Three. He replied "No," since he would only be spending five weeks at university before his final practicum. Because his university course also required a one week callback and a final one day callback with ongoing assignments during his practicum, this time did not feel like a separate chapter. We decided it was an Interlude -- a time between practicum experiences in which Zach could reflect on his previous practicum in order to prepare for the final practicum. When I asked him what chapter the final practicum experience was, Zach named it the Finale.

The Prelude, Chapter One, Chapter Two, the Interlude, and the Finale form five parallel chapters in each of the two books. Book One I have named "Voices of Authority." Book Two I have named after a favorite expression of Zach's, "Making it Happen."

I have referenced Zach's parts of the stories in two ways:

1. Excerpts from research conversation transcripts are identified with the letter Z, followed by the number of the transcript, followed by the page number. For example (Z7.12) represents page 12 of transcript number 7. The dates the transcribed conversations were recorded appear in Appendix A.

2. Excerpts from the journal Zach kept as a course requirement from January to April 1992 are identified by the date they were written. For example (February 16, 1992).

Learning the Choices

I was not surprised Zach had chosen Social Studies as his major. He often spoke of how we are all part of society while at the same time we are making choices of how to live our individual lives. Zach paid attention to the relationship between individual continuity and social interaction and showed concern about many of the tensions this relationship created. Zach noted a pivotal tension between individual freedom and social responsibility. He emphasized the importance of being able to fit in and work together while at the same time being free to make individual choices. In order to ensure that both individual freedom and social responsibility would occur, Zach believed there had to be a leader to keep society humming along. If there was no leader, people would go in their own separate directions and society would not progress. However, Zach was concerned with how leaders were chosen. While a leader was necessary, it was important the leader exercise authority on "behalf of the interest of the group, not as an exhibition of personal power" (Dewey, 1938, p. 54). Zach believed these positions should be earned. While individuals were not born into equality of condition, each individual should have equality of opportunity since all individuals began life with basic rights. While accreditation should be based on individual merit, there needed to be consensus about what standards would be used.

Zach was also concerned about the ways in which institutional policies and regulations imposed restrictions on the natural relationships that would develop among people in society since "they enforce artificial uniformity" (Dewey, 1938, p. 62). This tension between social conformity and individual freedom was a pivotal influence for Zach.

Zach was also fascinated by history. History helped Zach experience connections with his socio-cultural and political heritage. "An adequate sense of tradition manifests itself in a grasp of those future possibilities which the past has made available to the present" (MacIntyre,1981). This dimension of Social Studies focused on the tension inherent in tradition and change.

The relationships between individual freedom and social responsibility; personal integrity and standards of accreditation; imposition and expression; and tradition and change created a dynamic interplay of tensions as Zach constructed and reconstructed

meaning about teaching and learning during the third year of his teacher education program.

I was also not surprised Zach had chosen French as his minor. In order for individuals to work together in a productive society and understand each other, communication was the key. Since French is part of Canada's historical and cultural heritage, learning to speak French would widen the situations Zach could fit into and increase his ability to communicate with a wider variety of people. He had found his ability to communicate in German invaluable when he had visited Europe. Adding French would increase his ability to understand and communicate in different societies.

For Zach, both society and language were rule governed. Society needed rules so that individuals would not infringe on the rights of others. Rules were set by those in positions of authority. Dewey (1938) tells us "these rules have the sanction of tradition and precedent" (p. 53). The rules let Zach know what was expected of him as well as what he could expect from others. Language also needed to follow set rules so that we could each understand what other people meant. Clear communication was important for members of society to be able to make decisions and to know what was happening. For Zach, knowledge was useless if it was not communicated to others in order to get things done and make changes for the better. Rules were necessary to keep people accountable because not all people are virtuous and consider the rights of others when making decisions.

Zach saw the world as one of finite resources. Rules became necessary so that each individual could have access to his/her fair share of available resources. Since people want more than they have now, Zach believed it was inherent for people to compete for limited resources. Because the world is made up of finite resources, competition became a necessary evil. This competition was always in tension with the cooperation and caring necessary for a society to function.

These were some of the beliefs Zach brought with him to his teacher education program as he began the formal process of authoring his life as a teacher. They were pervasive influences underlying the choices Zach made as he constructed and reconstructed his knowing of teaching and learning.

The ways in which Zach authored his life as a teacher education student were shaped by the implicit structures of sacred stories and the mundane stories he heard and learned to tell. As I looked back over the interpretive field texts I had constructed from our research conversations, I heard many voices of authority shaping Zach's story of becoming a teacher. At times the voices came from Zach himself; at times the voices came

from external sources. At times these voices resonated with each other; at times they created dissonance. At times there was a cacophony of confusion and frustration.

As I paid closer attention, I began to see two different authorized versions of sacred stories being played out as Zach learned to author his life as a teacher education student. One version, authority as status, played a dominant role while another version, authority as connection, played a subservient but necessary supporting role. These two versions of authority provided a pivotal tension as Zach constructed and reconstructed his knowing about teaching and learning. Each version shaped Zach's world in different ways. In Zach's experience, the paradigmatic mode held a position of status in his teacher education program while the narrative mode, which provided knowing through personal connection, was not part of the official curriculum.

Finding the Balance

The tension between the paradigmatic version of authority as status and the narrative version of authority as connection was a pivotal influence for Zach as he constructed and reconstructed meaning about teaching and learning during the third year of his teacher education program. I have chosen to focus on this tension in order to illuminate ways in which Zach's construction of meaning influenced and was influenced by his experiences.

When Zach chose to author his life as a teacher, he needed to be accredited by those who lived the already authorized versions of teaching and learning. As a character in the university's and the schools' authorized versions of teacher education, for Zach, authoring his story of becoming a teacher was contingent on the authority of others. Learning to author his life as a teacher was a mutual shaping as Zach tried to find his own balance between the paradigmatic version of authority as status and the narrative version of authority as connection. As Zach authored his choices, he knew he was accountable to himself, the university, the schools, his cooperating teachers, and his students for the choices he made.

In the first book, I pay special attention to voice as Zach authors his story of becoming a teacher. In the second book, I focus on the plot lines that compose Zach's journey along his path of becoming a teacher.

Book I: The Voices of Authority

In this book, I show ways in which various voices of authority shaped Zach's knowing of teaching and learning as he struggled to develop his voice and construct his narrative knowing as a teacher. In each chapter, certain voices became dominant while others remained silent.

Prelude (May to August, 1991)

During May and June Zach was enrolled in a World History course as part of his Social Studies major. In the summer he took a French course to complete the requirements for his French minor. During this time Zach listened carefully to the paradigmatic versions of knowledge he was presented by the voices of his instructors and the texts he was required to read. In order to become a teacher, Zach knew he would need to learn these authorized versions and convince those already in authority that he could give a clear and accurate account of these versions. For Zach, since learning involved receiving knowledge from those who already knew the authorized versions, teaching would involve passing on knowledge already constructed and accepted as authorized versions. "You can learn something together, but you cannot teach somebody else something until you know it. Therefore, you are automatically teaching history" (Z4.15).

Since teaching would involve telling students what they needed to know, Zach needed to be able to tell it clearly. Developing rapport through "just talking" was not part of the "report talk" (Tannen, 1990) of teaching. "I don't care how I sound when I'm just talking, but when I'm telling, I have to tell in a clear way" (Z4.1).

I was intrigued by the way Zach used our early research transcripts as a way of evaluating his own clarity. While I had been focusing on what he had said, he paid attention to the ways in which he presented what he knew. Zach was upset after reading the transcript from our first research conversation. While I knew this was a natural reaction of many people when they first see their narrative oral language in written form, for Zach it was more than that. His concern was linked to his image of a professional teacher. He explained to me "as the teacher it's your duty, your job, whatever, to speak clearly and that's one thing I notice I don't do well enough yet. At least not to my standards of what I think should be" (Z4.1). I became aware of how Zach had learned to adopt the paradigmatic standard of objective clarity many of us value as the authorized version of voice.

In order to be listened to as a teacher, Zach told me he would need to know what he was talking about and be able to communicate clearly to his students. His authority would come from what he knew and how well he could express this knowledge to his students. He would also expect his students to let him know if they understood what he was saying. At this time, Zach's understanding of what he needed to do in a classroom in order to be listened to involved being clear and using appropriate vocabulary "because most of the things I will be talking about they should be able to understand. The only thing that might be a hindrance would be the vocabulary I am using. So tell me to change it" (Z4.6).

For Zach, being clear would mean being logical, sequential and concise in order to keep his students' attention and in order for the students to learn. I told Zach I found our conversations especially interesting when he felt he wasn't clear. I saw these parts of our conversations as places where he was constructing meanings and coming up with new understandings. He agreed that was possible, but did not see that as part of what a teacher does. "As a teacher you have to tell it clearly" (Z4.1). As the authority in the classroom, Zach had an obligation to his students to present them with a clear account of the knowledge they needed to receive in order for them to be able to make responsible competent choices in authoring their own lives.

In order to be listened to, Zach believed he needed to speak and write in ways that "follow the rules so everybody can understand" (Z4.4). For Zach, this meant being clear, credible, and persuasive. In order for Zach to be listened to by his university instructors, he knew he would need to give an account that fit the paradigmatic version he thought they expected. University instructors would be listening for a traditional standard of format and content "because that is a quick way of assessing where somebody's at in the way of intelligence by the way that they write" (Z4.4).

During this time, Zach was concerned with the difficulties of putting his thoughts on paper. Here Zach needed to find the right words and put them together well. Zach paid particular attention to the canons of literary format required by his instructors as set out in the American Psychological Association publication manual and the Modern Language Association handbook. He emphasized the importance of "punctuation, grammar, syntax, everything that helps put it together. Is it put together right?" (Z4.3). He told me the rules were important "because those are the only things, these rules that we have, are the only things that guide how we speak and what we speak actually to make it clear for the next person to understand what we're saying" (Z4.3). Zach was not only concerned with the format of the papers he was required to write, but the content as well because "every sentence I write down goes through my head 20 times before it goes on paper, because it's

got to be just right. Once it's written it's there for all to see and behold and criticize" (Z4.3).

Zach helped me become aware of the vast differences between the narrative qualities of spoken language and the paradigmatic qualities of written language. "When I speak, I can constantly change my mind. If somebody doesn't take it quite right in a conversation, I'll understand right away where they're missing out and I'll be able to clarify myself. On an exam, I can't. There it's one chance and that's it" (Z4.3). Zach knew his spoken language was not appropriate for written papers. The process of translating narrative ideas into written text imposed standards and restrictions as Zach tried to make his meaning clear. Zach needed to shape the ideas he was constructing to fit into a predetermined presentational format. I began to realize how pervasive a force our literary tradition had in shaping the way Zach constructed his own knowing.

The authorized format for written text at the university was a well constructed argument. Zach knew arguments could help him develop his own voice of authority as he clarified his own knowing and persuaded others he was right. Winning an argument would mean Zach's ideas were listened to and accepted "because my point is better, because it is thought out and I've managed to think out somebody else's argument. Clarified it in my own mind and then override it with things I've found" (Z4.8). Zach had learned to construct arguments in his university papers to convince his instructors he knew what he was talking about.

Zach had learned to value argument as the authorized version of gaining clarity and credibility by forcing himself and others to think about and back up what they were saying. When someone else won the argument, Zach told me he still learned "because they had something that I didn't consider. It helps me because then I get that feedback and I can rearrange my argument, either to change it, or to better it to overcome that" (Z4.8).

Argument provided a public space for Zach to question his own personal beliefs as well as the beliefs of others. A good argument could help Zach persuade others while at the same time clarifying for himself where he stood. He told me he enjoyed forcing others to explain the reasons for their beliefs because "in order to relay that fact in an argument they have to think about it themselves and then they're either going to clarify that argument or toss it" (Z4.8/9). I began to understand how Zach used argument as a way of forcing others to become accountable for thinking about why they believed what they were saying.

Zach imagined argument would provide a good teaching strategy for questioning students in order to get them to think carefully about what they believed. Zach told me "because" was not an answer and, in an argument, students "have to start thinking why.

They have to carry on the 'because.' Playing devil's advocate forces them to do that and they have to come to grips with why they believe what they believe" (Z4.9).

Zach did not like conversations that went around in circles because he did not see them as getting anywhere. Conversations could not help him make clear decisions the way arguments could. While conversations were fine when we were just talking, as a teacher Zach would need to be able to make decisions in order to decide what should happen next. Since Zach would be accountable for the choices he made, he wanted to be certain he was making the best choices possible.

But Zach was concerned with more than clarity and persuasiveness. Zach also began to recognize which voices would be valued and which would be listened to in the university's authorized versions. Zach wanted to shape his knowledge to fit the versions of those who were already in positions of authority. "It's got to be proven and according to the rules of the university you have to have somebody with a doctorate in front of their name prove it for you" (Z4.13). This constrained the ideas he felt able to present in his papers. At this point Zach knew he had to receive credibility from others until those in authority believed he knew enough. In order to have his ideas accepted, he knew they needed to be supported by those who were already recognized by their titles as having voices of authority. Using quotations became part of the writing game as Zach authored papers to get his own ideas accepted and at the same time to show those in authority that he too was willing to play the game in order to reach his goal of becoming a teacher.

Zach's ideas were influenced by the authority of his instructors and the texts he read. Zach also listened to the voices that connected with, and lent support to, his own narrative knowledge. In this way, he could add credibility to his own personal knowing and his own authority. As Zach struggled to give voice to his knowing, he found himself playing a game of manipulation by using the words of those in authority "and if you put a whole bunch of them together you'll end up with your point, but you need something to give your paper or your statement credibility. It's not just off the top of my head" (Z4.13). Zach needed to use an authorized version in order to be heard and those already in authority would decide whether or not Zach's version was acceptable. "I try to be fair but I imagine that subconsciously I probably am manipulating them to a point right into my scheme of things" (Z1.10). However, he knew how to play with the credibility rules to make space for his own voice to be heard. "It's fair game. I don't necessarily agree with it, but we're going to do it anyway" (Z1.10).

The "credibility" game Zach learned to play at university reinforced his understanding of the rules that were part of the tradition of constructing paradigmatic knowledge, his understanding of who is allowed to construct new knowledge, and his

understanding of what knowledge would be valued within educational institutions. Zach knew the authorized versions of paradigmatic knowledge were hierarchically ordered and the more he acquired, the more authority he would have.

> Learning and discovering are two different things. You learn what is past because you can only learn something that is already there. You can discover something new. But then, because you're a student, or only a teacher, you're not a doctor, whatever you discover doesn't count unless someone else discovers it with a doctor in front of their name (laugh). I'm pessimistic in that. I don't like that rule. I don't like the fact that just because I don't have all this "cultural capital" lugging behind me, the fact that I don't have that means that I'm not smart enough to come up with a new idea, according to the institution. But somebody in the upper ranks must protect their position. Therefore, they're the only ones that can come up with new ideas and anyone lower coming up with those ideas would challenge that position. So they wouldn't accept it and that's the hierarchy. There's nothing you can do about it. The only way you can beat that is to go through the motions and attain that cultural capital, and then you can do it your way, but by that time, you're so engrained in the institutional way of doing things you're probably going to do exactly the same thing they've been doing. I don't know. I hope not. You can always hope. (Z4.15)

However, Zach also imagined his role as a teacher to be more than teaching from the book "because the book never carries it all" (Z4.14). While the authorized texts would provide reference points for the particular courses Zach would be required to teach, any text would be a very limited version of the possible stories that could be told. "The book is just an aid. It's not meant to be 'this is all you have to learn,' once you learn this you're done" (Z4.14). There were more stories to tell and Zach wanted his students to realize there would always be more stories to hear. "If that's the one thing you do you have to make a student realize that it doesn't stop here. It's continual, never ending, until the day you die you'll never get it all. If they start to believe 'if I memorize this book I know it all,' then they stop and you don't want them to stop" (Z4.14).

During this time Zach focused on accumulating as much paradigmatic knowledge as he could. In order to author his life as a teacher, he needed to learn the stories that were already part of the teaching community. He needed to convince those in authority at the university that he was becoming cultivated into the authorized stories of the teaching community. He needed to develop his own narrative history within that community and be able to give an account of his paradigmatic knowledge when called upon to do so.

Chapter One (September to mid November, 1991)

When September came and Zach moved into the third year of his program, he was surprised at how many after-degree students were in his classes. He initially imagined there would be "more competition because everybody's going to be smarter. They've all got degrees behind them" (Z6.22). Zach believed these students knew more than he did and valued what they had to tell. Because they already had degrees he felt he could learn from them. However, it was the stories these students told of their experiences which contributed "such a diverse set of examples that it's always something new coming out, always something interesting" (Z6.24). Zach was able to make his own personal connections with their stories. He valued these stories "because suddenly you've got this wide range of experiences. So you don't have to experience it yourself to learn it" (Z7.14). These contextual examples helped Zach enrich his knowledge of the information presented by his instructors.

During this term Zach recognized familiar concepts in the body of information he was receiving. "Basically it's not brand new anymore" (Z6.25). As he heard information and concepts repeated in different classes, he told me, "I have some place to start. I'm not grasping at air anymore" (Z6.25). As information became an embodied part of Zach's personal practical knowledge, he began to see himself as having a body of professional knowledge. "There's something there and all I'm doing is building on it. That makes it easier" (Z6.25). Zach was being cultivated into the stories of the teaching community. He was beginning to be able to tell the stories he believed teachers needed to know.

Zach no longer just accepted what he was told, but was beginning to publicly question inconsistencies he was beginning to hear in the authorized versions he was being presented. At times, what his instructors presented was contradictory to what Zach had learned in other courses. He questioned the information he was presented in order to get it clear in his own mind as well as to clarify it for the instructor. Being able to question the information being presented made Zach realize he knew something about the content. He was hearing different versions and wanted to clarify that the version he was accepting was the right one. He wanted to be able to tell accurate accounts to his future students.

Zach began to make connections between the information he had already received and the information in his new courses. He described his present Educational Foundations course as "a perfect course for me because it just upgrades my Social Studies" (Z5.6). As Zach began to receive different versions of the same story he was able to see how different disciplines related to each other. "We were going through things like the French Revolution, and before that the Protestant Reformation, and that's all part of my History so

that all fits together" (Z5.6). His experience in the courses helped him to see that the stories could be told from different perspectives. "Everything's the same. Slightly different angles, but all the same anyway" (Z5.6).

As Zach began to view himself as holding a body of professional knowledge, he began to acknowledge his own credibility as a teacher. He began to feel he could become a teacher because "I wasn't just the know nothing student anymore and that probably would be part of the reason why I was starting to feel that 'Yes, I can be a teacher,' because I am getting confident. I do know a few things" (Z6.25). Experience in his courses had provided him with what he believed was relevant information. "Suddenly the fact that you are starting to go over things or pull things that you do know means you have a base. You're not waiting for somebody to give it to you. You've got it. Nobody can take it away from you" (Z7.27). The larger the body of knowledge he acquired, the more authority he felt he would have in the classroom as he was able to voice this knowledge without depending on others. "I'm no longer relying solely on the instructor for information. I'm no longer relying solely on textbooks for information. There's something in my head. It's coming out" (Z6.25).

Zach also valued an Educational Foundations course in critical thinking. He believed critical thinking provided a way to come to clear understandings that would help him "when you're listening to somebody and they're trying to present you with some kind of claim or something, eliminate the fluff out of their claim so you can make a solid decision" (Z6.14). Being able to make clear decisions would be important as a teacher in order to be fair, to be credible, and to keep control in the classroom. Since Zach would be accountable for the choices he made, he wanted to make the best choices possible.

Zach continued to use our transcript conversations to evaluate his ability to get his ideas across clearly and concisely. "I can reiterate, especially if there's some confusion but I cannot go over and over. You lose your students just like that" (Z6.7). If he was going to be able to hold his students' attention, he would need to be worthy of being listened to. Even though we talked again about the differences between conversational and presentational language, Zach saw them as very connected. "It's all tied together. It's all from the same mouth, the same mind" (Z6.8). Since his authority as a teacher would come from his professional knowledge, he would need to make his personal voice more professional rather than his professional voice more personal. "If I can allow myself to get this bad in a conversation, then I could probably do it in a lecture too so I have to start watching myself" (Z6.8).

During this time, Zach told me how he was spending more time at home. The way in which his family was beginning to acknowledge his status as a teacher as someone

"expected to know" (Z8.10) made me aware of another source of his narrative knowing of the teacher as the one who knows. He spent time helping his sister and a German exchange student "and I have to ensure that they are doing a good job in school (laugh) because I know what school is all about supposedly" (Z8.10). Since he was a teacher now, "I deal with it. If I don't know it, I better find it out (laugh)" (Z8.10). Zach's laugh when he said this made me wonder whether he was beginning to realize teachers do not know it all or whether he knew he did not know as much as teachers know. An incident at his grandparents' reinforced Zach's sense of becoming someone whose ideas were valued. "I have a university education. I deal with legal matters. I do all that now" (Z8.9). When Zach's grandparents listened to his advice over his uncle's, he was surprised. His mother explained, "They're not as 'intellectual' as I am, according to my grandparents" (Z8.9).

Zach also began to notice he was talking more. He told me, "I used to be a listener" (Z6.12) and seemed surprised at the change in himself. "I don't know if it's so much to hear myself speak, or if it's because I think my ideas are right" (Z6.12). His own sense of knowing grew as people listened to what he had to say. "I think it was a gradual changing point where people wanted to hear what I had to say and now I'm almost pushing what I have to say" (Z6.12). Zach began to think about his role as a listener. Since communication would involve an interchange of ideas for people to understand each other, it was important for Zach to be able to silence his voice in order to give others the opportunity to express their ideas. Zach said, "I guess somehow, I portray a help, somebody who won't hurt, or safe. Safe would be a good word" (Z6.12). Later he commented, "Don't lose the fact that you listen a lot. Try and keep the balance. I just pointed out that I am changing. Why, I don't know. For some reason" (Z7.20).

During this time Zach also had the opportunity to practice his authority as a teacher in a peer teaching situation. For the first lesson, Zach chose an area where his personal practical knowing from previous experience gave him confidence. He knew what he was talking about. Zach presented a lesson on horseback riding, a topic with which he was very familiar. He focused particularly on the safety aspect of mounting a horse. He brought a saddle to class and also dressed the part. He had also imagined using a "southern accent," but soon dismissed this idea because "you're trying to portray an act and as soon as you do that, the students will see through you" (Z7.5). He had learned in his Teaching Methods class the importance of creating a "motivational set" and he began to think about the difference between creating a set and being artificial "because you would be using that to create a set almost, but it just relates to the fact that you're supposed to be who you are, because sooner or later, the act is going to fall apart" (Z7.5). Being authentic was a necessary part of being listened to. Being authentic involved speaking with a voice

connected to his own narrative knowing. Assuming a voice that was not his own to create an effect could be damaging to both his personal and professional credibility "so you show them who you are right away. Don't try and maintain some type of character that's not real because you'll find that it'll be more damaging later on" (Z7.5).

It was also Zach's responsibility to speak in a way his students could understand. "You have to always be thinking about the audience" (Z7.6). His role as a teacher was not to impress them with what he knew, but to teach them what they needed to know. He would need to transmit this body of knowledge "at the level that everybody can understand where it's not too easy for some, but you're better off being too easy for a couple than being too hard for the majority" (Z7.6).

Zach's next peer teaching assignment was to be student centered. Zach struggled with putting this one together. The topic he chose was the Canadian Constitution because this lesson was to be in the area of his major which was Social Studies. He wanted the class to understand the complexity of coming up with a constitution that could represent all Canadians. Zach asked the question "What is a Canadian?" and hoped the students would come up with a variety of perspectives to show the diversity of Canadian culture. While he wanted to "give everybody the opportunity for input" (Z7.21/22), he felt he needed to be prepared for whatever his students might come up with and tried to imagine a variety of possible scenarios. Since Zach would expect his students to express their personal views, he could not anticipate ahead of time what the responses would be. This left him feeling uncertain about his ability to respond. He wanted a variety of perspectives and worried that the students might not come up with the variety essential to the lesson he had planned. He prepared examples he could present if needed. In this lesson Zach wanted to "draw the students in, draw your listeners in. Draw everybody into the conversation and give them all a chance because everybody has experience, everybody has information that might be useful" (Z7.21/22).

Zach's third lesson presented problems. He had been told by his instructors that lessons could be teacher centered or student centered. Zach privately questioned this distinction. "That's all fine but they are not individual concepts" (Z7.6). He believed both the teacher and the students needed to contribute to each lesson; lessons could not be one or the other. "A lot of the stuff is teacher initiated but that's not teacher centered. You're just basically sending them in the right direction and then you're making sure they're not going too far off the path but they're still wandering on their own" (Z7.6).

However, he had been told to develop one teacher centered and two student centered lessons. Zach struggled to develop a student centered lesson in his French minor. He could not come up with a student centered French lesson since none of the students in

his peer teaching group knew any French. To have ideas emerging from students in English during a French lesson did not make sense. Zach finally approached his instructor and explained why he felt the lesson would need to be teacher centered and was relieved when his instructor listened to and accepted his reasons for his choice of having a teacher centered lesson.

While at the beginning of the semester Zach was pleased with his growing body of knowledge, he continually worried about whether he would know enough to be able to teach. Knowing enough meant knowing more than his students. Zach was particularly concerned about his knowledge of French. Here language would not only be a barrier to communication, but a threat to his professional authority as a French teacher. He was not as concerned about his knowledge of Social Studies because the language was not a barrier. Being fluent in English, he could always find out what he needed to know in the area of Social Studies. With French, he felt he did not know enough of the vocabulary. Since for Zach authority was connected to both how much he knew and how well he was able to express what he knew, he felt insecure about teaching French. In Social Studies he felt personally and professionally competent; in French he felt neither. Because he was required to do his coming practicum in his French minor, Zach would need to learn how to assert his authority as a teacher in the area where he felt least competent to do so.

Zach had mentioned to me earlier that "as far as the University of Alberta is concerned, I'm qualified to teach French. My minor is complete" (Z5.6). He certainly did not feel qualified, "not at a higher level anyway" (Z5.7). In order to increase his knowledge of French he hoped to "go to France or Quebec and spend some time there" (Z5.6). However, at the present time, Zach had no opportunity to increase his knowledge of French. As the time for his practicum placement came closer, he became more and more concerned since he had "never spent any time in a French classroom whatsoever" (Z5.7). Because he had never taken French himself in junior high or high school, he had no narrative knowing to connect with a French class at this level. "I have no idea what to expect in a French classroom" (Z5.7). Although Zach had completed his French teaching methods course where his instructor "started on something about lesson planning and that. I have no idea what the classroom would be like" (Z5.7). The teaching methods Zach had been presented in class were meaningless as he had no experience to connect to the theories.

For his four week practicum, Zach had been placed in a junior high school which housed approximately 300 Grade 7 to Grade 9 students. The school was in a small urban setting close to where Zach lived. While he did not know any of the students, he had met a

few of the teachers in other local contexts. Here he would be teaching French language as a subject area to students who did not speak French outside of the school context.

When Zach got his school placement, he went to the school to meet Pat, his cooperating teacher. He dropped in one morning to say hello "and things just went perfectly. So smoothly. Everything was just great. I'm going to do this no problem. I want to get these exams over with so I can go and start teaching" (Z10.6). During that first visit Pat had a preparation period and she and Zach spent the time getting acquainted with each other. Zach told me he noticed many ways in which Pat's attitudes toward teaching were similar to his own. Zach's initial sense of rapport with Pat made him feel comfortable enough to confide in her his concern with not knowing enough. "All weekend I've been kind of anxious. Not so much the fact that I'm going to be teaching again because I don't have a problem with that, being among students and being a teacher, that's not a problem. I had a problem with the language -- the subject content. Am I expert enough?" (Z10.6). He had worried about students knowing more than he did, especially those who might speak French at home as they could be a challenge to his authority. He told me his greatest fear was "if I get a Francophone student and suddenly they catch me" (Z10.9).

When Pat showed Zach her unit plans, he realized that "they don't know more than me. I do know more than them. And suddenly that confidence level is back" (Z10.10). Zach left this initial meeting with an immense sense of relief. "That intimidation. That's what I had. But now that's gone" (Z10.10). He believed that as long as he knew more than his students in the subject area he was required to teach, he would have the authority to keep everything under control.

> The fact that I'm going to know what I'm talking about is all I need. As soon as I know that, the rest falls in place. Strange. That's my first concern always. Do I know this stuff? Am I qualified to be up at the front of these people trying to tell them something? If I have that, having transactions with people works just naturally. I like that and I don't worry about that. It just happens. It's just the subject stuff that I have the problem with. And I don't have to worry about it. That's good. (Z10.11/12)

At this point in time, Zach did not see classroom management as something to worry about. His narrative knowing of working with others led him to believe the relationships would take care of themselves. Teaching would be the same as any other kind of interaction with people. His authority would come from knowing his subject area better than his students. Developing rapport with students would happen naturally.

Chapter Two (mid-November to mid-December, 1991)

While Zach entered his practicum with some sense of relief that he knew enough French to be seen as an authority by his students, he soon found that his position was a complex interplay of many different voices of authority and diverse agendas. He soon found there was much more to learn about teaching than subject matter content.

As a student in his university courses, Zach had been responsible for listening carefully to the information his instructors had presented and preparing assignments that would show he understood. He was the student and his instructors were the teachers. His peers had played supportive roles in peer teaching situations. In the school, relationships were much more complex. Zach had been delegated certain responsibilities by the authority of the curriculum, the school, the university, and his cooperating teacher, Pat. Zach needed to prove to Pat, her students, and himself he had the ability to assume the responsibilities he had been given.

Being both a student and a teacher forced Zach to live as two different characters simultaneously. He would be accountable for living versions of a teaching story he was just beginning to learn to tell. How well he was able to live a story as teacher would show those already in authority whether or not he was competent. In order to fulfil the curriculum requirements and meet Pat's expectations, Zach would need to control the classroom situation. "You're in control. You have been, first of all, you have the power, you're invested with that power" (Z14.14). Zach was in a dual position of responsibility where he would need, not only to do what was expected of him as a student, but as a teacher to ensure his students followed his directions. He knew he would be held accountable for his students' actions as well as his own. "You're given that right to do this. You're not only given the right, you're given the expectation that you must do this. You don't have a choice, right. You have some choices in how you go about doing it but this is what you are expected" (Z14.14).

At the same time, Zach was also aware that as a student teacher he was not part of the ongoing life of the school. He was entering the ongoing classroom story as a stranger and as such was placed in the position of being expected to author future stories while simultaneously learning the authorized versions already constructed by Pat and her students. He would be replacing Pat for a short time and needed to author what happened in the classroom in ways which would fit in with the story Pat and her class were living "because she's going to have to pick up my pieces when I leave so if I'm not up to par, then she's going to have a problem and that's not fair. She's being too damned nice to do

that to her. Somehow, someway, I will get this done. How, I haven't quite figured out yet" (Z11.5).

In playing Pat's part as teacher Zach would need to accept her responsibility for fulfilling the curriculum objectives set out in the Program of Studies. Zach was aware of the need to stay within Pat's plot outlines since she was ultimately accountable for seeing the curriculum was followed within her classes. "We have to teach what we're told to teach. If we can do it quickly and find more time to throw in extra things and all that, great. But in the end, the curriculum must be followed. I can't believe I'm saying that (laugh)" (Z14.13).

Zach appreciated the support he received from Pat and the rest of the staff. They helped Zach feel "like I belong there. I feel at home" (Z11.3). This sense of connection and being accepted as a person helped support Zach in his struggle to gain professional authority within the classroom "because somebody's helping you out" (Z11.3).

Zach was pleased with how he initially gained the attention of Pat's students. They seemed to see him as a teacher and accepted his position as one of authority. He knew the gendered story of male dominance would initially be to his advantage. "I have the size, I have the deep voice and everything. I get that initial respect a lot easier than some people" (Z11.4). Zach was unsure whether he would be able to maintain this initial position. While he felt students had given him this initial respect because he was a male teacher, "now, it's a matter if I keep it or not. So now my honeymoon period is over and they're starting to push and to chat and they're thinking 'Oh yeah, ok, it's no big deal. It's just another teacher'" (Z11.4). Zach knew it would be up to him to prove he deserved that respect.

Zach knew he had formal power because of his position, but he wanted to gain the respect of students through the relationship he was able to develop within the classroom. Finding a balance between authority as status and authority as connection with the students was a continual dilemma. Zach needed the students to listen to him in order to do his job of covering the curriculum "so you've got to know what you're talking about when you're teaching something" (Z14.7). He also knew the relationships were what they would remember. "But, almost guaranteed, none of those students will remember what they were taught in that particular class. But they learned how to learn. They learned how to act as a human being, how to work in a social situation, how to be respected, how to give respect, and that's what they remember" (Z14.7).

However, finding a balance between the paradigmatic report talk required for teaching the subject matter and the narrative rapport talk required for developing

relationships with students was not an easy one to achieve. When I asked Zach what he thought it meant to teach now that he had some experience, he laughed and said:

> What does teaching mean? To pass on knowledge. Our jobs are to teach knowledge, to teach concepts. Our job is not to become a friend, as most of us make the first mistake. Once we realize, we start doing our jobs. Becoming a friend is a necessary part in order to make them learn. Once you start realizing that, it all entwines together but in the end, teaching takes precedence over being a friend. You're not there to be their buddy. You're there to do a job for them. That job is to teach them. (Z14.8)

Zach believed his authority needed to come from his own credibility, not the imposed authority of formal position and policy. "Like I can give them DTs [detentions] and they've got this beautiful little green form you can send down to the office that's going to go home and that's discipline problems. I don't want to use that" (Z12.6). He wanted himself and his students to become personally accountable to each other rather than using imposed restrictions. "If we have problems, we will deal with it in my classroom. I don't want to go elsewhere" (Z12.6).

In order to do his job, students needed to pay attention to what Zach was saying. "When I'm teaching, when I'm 'lecturing' as they say and imparting this great information on these students I expect them to pay attention" (Z14.15/16). Zach needed students to pay attention in order to fulfil the curriculum requirements. "Now, it's my position to bring on this new information. That's my job, right. So, since that's my job and this is what's expected of me, I expect the students to have the respect to let me do my job. And if we do it quick enough, we'll have all this extra time so they can do what they want to do, right" (Z14.15/16). He saw the required curriculum as the vocabulary and grammar the students were required to learn. He wanted to get through the vocabulary and grammar as quickly as possible so the students would have the skills to use this information in group situations. It was important that students could use what they had learned. The French vocabulary they were learning would be useless if the students were not able to use it to communicate with each other.

The students did not always give Zach the attention and respect he felt was necessary to accomplish his job. His belief in the importance of the students' need to communicate with each other was often in conflict with his belief that teaching involved delivering knowledge to the students. I could hear the carefully camouflaged frustration as Zach explained, "I <u>want</u> them to talk with each other, but when I say something and when I'm trying to talk and I have a few people talking, I put them on the spot because I will not have that" (Z11.4).

Zach became more and more frustrated as he tried to cover the required curriculum so he and his students could move into the group work Zach had planned. "As I explained before, my time is short. I'm on a deadline. I'm trying to get someplace very quickly in order to ensure that we have time to do some of these other things" (Z11.4). The students at times resisted following the curriculum version Zach was trying to author and tried to set their own agendas. As conversations continued to emerge spontaneously in classes, Zach struggled with the tension between getting students to listen to him and allowing them to listen to each other. Zach did not mind them talking because he felt the social interaction and communication were important. However, Zach made a clear distinction in his own mind between when the students were working and when he was teaching. Because teaching involved Zach telling students what they needed to know, students' conversations could not be part of teaching. When I asked if he had explained to his students how he made the distinction between them talking while they were working, and listening while he was teaching, he said, "I've never outlined that. And I don't think I ever will because basically, when I'm at the front, it's implied. They have to pick up on their own, I think. But I may change my mind on that" (Z12.6).

Zach expected the students to pay attention while he was teaching because "I can't afford to be slowed down" (Z11.6). Zach attempted to be "abundantly clear" (Z11.10) in his instructions and expected his students to be clear as well. He wanted his students to learn to communicate and to learn to put things together right as he had learned to do in his university assignments. Zach imagined students who did not follow instructions "weren't paying attention" (Z11.10). If they were going to receive what they needed to know, they would have to listen carefully.

While Zach wanted to allow students individual freedom, he also needed to be able to pull them back together as a cohesive group. The tension between rapport talk and report talk mounted, creating increasing dissonance for Zach between what he believed to be the explicitly valued curriculum and his implicit valuing of narrative connection. "This is possibly sounding a little bit too traditional, but I demand that when I speak, they listen. There are no ifs, ands, or buts about it" (Z11.6). It was this tension that led to "the bubble breaking."

Zach described himself as going into the practicum wearing a protective bubble of knowing enough and being in control. He worried about being seen as a teacher by his students, his cooperating teacher, and himself. He worried about showing any weakness in front of students as he believed this would shatter the professional image he was trying to build. Zach told me how he had "messed up a couple of times here and there, really

little things, but I catch myself before she, like she doesn't even want to say something" (Z11.2).

While Zach had alluded to the "honeymoon period" being over and commented on how the students were beginning to push, our conversations did not dwell on these points but rather moved on to how he was able to deal with the situation by thorough planning. The more Zach told me how well things were going, the more I began to wonder who he was trying to convince, me or himself. It wasn't until after the "bubble broke" that Zach wrote in his journal "All along I knew my time was coming. The kids were feeling me out before. I was on the 'honeymoon'" (Journal entry, November 25, 1991).

One evening Zach came to the university looking exhausted and upset. I knew something was bothering him but I was on a ten minute break from the course I was teaching and I had to leave. All he told me at that time was that all it took was "one word." The next night he explained more fully what had happened but he still could not really talk about it. The sense I made of his story was that he had been having some trouble getting the students to listen when he was teaching a lesson.

This particular incident tock place near the end of a lesson when Zach "knew they had a big exam the next day, and I wanted to get through the stuff to give them as much background as they can have for this exam and they just refused" (Z12.1). He told me he did not yell. Zach wrote about it in his journal in the following way:

> I asked them to be quiet a number of times but it only seemed to work for about a minute before they were at it again. About 10 min. before the class ended I had had enough. I raised my voice. QUIET! It was loud and I think it shocked the kids. It shocked me. I'm sure people heard me down the hall. It worked! One word did it. (Journal entry, November 25, 1991)

Zach stopped teaching. "I sat down, I closed my books, I looked at them for a little while -- about a minute or two. I just looked at them" (Z12.5). Zach then spent the remainder of the class time letting the students know how he felt. "Then I started to talk, very low, like not a deep voice, just a quiet voice" (Z12.5). During this time Zach spoke to the students as a person in his authentic voice rather than in the "teacher voice" he was trying to assume. Zach's anger and frustration had allowed him to break through the protective bubble he had created and to speak as a person rather than as a character in role. "Basically, during the whole speech up there I said I'm going to be here for another two and a half weeks. I don't ever want to see this kind of behavior again" (Z12.5). This unplanned event left Zach feeling uneasy.

> What was frustrating about that situation was that this was my first unsupervised class. Pat had to be elsewhere. My first thoughts were that I failed. I let things go too far. I should have stopped things before they became a problem. I should have done things differently. (Journal entry, November 25, 1991)

Zach was impressed and relieved when many of the students who had been talking came up as they were leaving the class and apologized. "I heard numerous 'Sorry'. So, maybe it did work out. Maybe it was a positive thing. But only time will tell that and I probably won't find out this week" (Z12.7).

The incident of the bubble breaking reminded me of the time Zach had talked about using a southern accent during his horse back riding lesson. Assuming a voice that was not his own to create an effect could be damaging to both his personal and professional credibility "because sooner or later, the act is going to fall apart so you show them who you are right away you know, don't try and maintain some type of character that's not real because you'll find that it'll be more damaging later on" (Z7.5).

Now that his bubble had burst he could begin to imagine a different version of himself as a teacher. Up until this time, Zach had believed a voice of authority had to be a voice of certainty. He had talked with a graduate education student, Carol, the night before and that conversation had helped. Zach had previously seen himself as a person who could help others by listening to them and offering advice. Reversing this situation had not been a story which Zach had lived. "I'm just not used to that. Talking to people about stuff like that. Like this was a situation where I was not sure where I was headed. I don't like to be unsure. I especially do not like to advertise that I am not sure where I'm headed" (Z12.2).

Zach was now beginning to see the possible value in sharing his uncertainty with others "because I talked to people, that all helped and now, I'm on a path again. I understand what's going on and I see where I want to go" (Z12.2). Since he had often mentioned to me how he wanted to know what his weaknesses were so he could improve them, I wondered why it was so difficult for him to share this story. He explained to me in the following way:

> You don't have to show weakness in order to be able to see it. And to a point, strength is good. But I'm also starting to realize that letting other people see some of the things, that's not necessarily weakness. That's human. That's natural. And that's starting to let people see that you're human I guess. That you are a person just like them. (Z14.19)

In this situation Zach began to understand that sharing involved acknowledging uncertainty in himself as well as in others. However, publicly voicing his uncertainty was a story

Zach had learned never to tell. He had lived a story in which admitting difficulty and uncertainty was a story of weakness. "But somehow I'm still brought up from the old school. Basically my father and that. The man does not show weakness, any difficulty. You do not show weakness. That's just the way it is" (Z14.19). Having the courage to share this story publicly provided an opportunity for Zach to awaken to new ways of thinking about what sharing his uncertainty with others could mean.

After this incident, Zach wanted to be alone with the class the next time they met "because this is almost a test now. I've got to get through it. And I don't think I'm going to have any problem" (Z12.3).

Zach was now able to acknowledge his uncertainty openly. At the same time Zach kept trying "to build some type of reputation to know that this is the line, you can't go past that. And that's it" (Z13.9). While Zach believed as a teacher he needed to be the final authority in the classroom he was still trying to learn an authorized version of teaching that seemed more authentic with his lived story. "I have to deal with it. I really hate detentions. That's not my style. And I'm trying to find something else" (Z13.9). For Zach, it was crucial as a teacher "to have some type of authority in order to maintain that forward momentum" (Z14.18).

Interlude (January, 1992)

Zach spent this five week period at university preparing for his next practicum. I sensed this was the lull after the storm. Zach now had his own narrative knowledge of teaching to listen to as he attended his Social Studies Curriculum Methods course. His reference point had changed. During his previous university experience, his instructors and text books had provided the points of reference. He trusted they would tell him what he needed to know. Now I saw Zach himself becoming his own reference point. His narrative knowing of teaching showed him what to pay attention to in order to help him author his own teaching stories. There was no course filler. "I need it all!" (Jan.13, 1992). He began to connect what he was being told at the university to his own experiences in a classroom. Zach described in his journal how his experience during the four week practicum had changed his perspective. "I am quite certain that I will view all my future courses differently as a result of having been in front of my own classroom" (January 13, 1992).

In the Methods course Zach focused attentively on his instructor's "laid back teaching style" (January 13, 1992) and tried to figure out how, "while we always seem to be on a pre-destined task, Al manages to keep the environment informal" (January 13,

1992). Zach was beginning to focus not only on the report talk being presented but the rapport Al created in classes as well.

Zach saw the atmosphere Al constructed as something he wanted to create in his own classroom since "the relaxed atmosphere helps the students to get down to the business of learning because it is not being forced upon them. They enjoy it" (January 13, 1992). Zach also believed creating this atmosphere was "probably easier to do in a university classroom because of high student motivation" (January 13, 1992).

I began to notice Zach paying attention to teaching strategies which would help him deal with some of the conflicts he had experienced in his practicum. Ideas which would help him increase his own authority began to catch his attention. One technique Zach paid attention to "dealt with discussion management and keeping student input at equal amounts" (January 13, 1992). This reminded me of his previous practicum dilemma of managing discussions. Students were to put three coins on their desks and remove one each time they contributed to the discussion. Zach felt this would "put a limit on the very vocal students as well as motivate the more introverted students to contribute to the discussion" (January 13, 1992). Another technique connected with Zach's desire to hold his students' attention while he was teaching. "Do not immediately expose the whole transparency because students' minds should be on the point you are addressing and not the rest of the transparency" (January 15, 1992). The use of debate connected with Zach's belief in argument as a valuable learning technique. Zach wrote, "It appears to be a superb way to deal with selected issues in a classroom environment. All sides would be covered because of the 'for' or 'against' stance a debate demands" (January 28, 1992).

Zach was informed of his final practicum placement during the first week of classes. This time, he had been placed in another junior high school in a rural setting close to where he lived. He would be teaching Social Studies to Grade 7 students and Health to students in Grades 7, 8, and 9. This school housed approximately 600 Grade 7 to Grade 9 students who lived in a semi-rural setting close to a large town and a large city. Zach was pleased with a second junior high placement. He felt teaching senior high school students would be easier than teaching junior high school students and he wanted the practice which would test and help him develop his teaching and classroom management skills. He also believed his first job would most likely be in a junior high school since senior high school jobs were more prestigious and were filled by teachers who already had seniority within the school systems.

Zach was eager to go to the school to meet Anne, his new cooperating teacher. As he had done with Pat, he would drop in and say hello. Zach valued face-to-face

communication and chose to talk in person whenever possible. "I like to see your face and your expression. It's not the same on the telephone. I can't see you" (Z16.11).

When Zach went to the school, Anne told him he would be teaching a unit on Japan in Grade 7 Social Studies. Zach got a copy of the school's text and teacher's manual for the unit he would be teaching on Japan. Three days later, Zach gave me a history lesson on Japan and commented, "Gee, I can't believe I know all this stuff" (Z15.13). He had read the textbook and Teacher's Guide thoroughly and had spent time imagining how he would use or adapt these resources. "There's 12 chapters. We're going to do 12 chapters. But, how fast I go through it, each particular chapter, or where I stop and add some of my own stuff, that's going to be the difference, right" (Z15.12/13). Zach focused on both the content and the process of teaching. Zach felt compelled to cover the knowledge presented in the text book, but how he actually proceeded was up to him as long as he focused on cultural change as required by the Program of Studies. He planned on using some of the activities presented in the teacher's guide book. However, he also planned to construct some of the activities himself. He was beginning to realize he would make curricular selections based on his narrative knowing of teaching. The activities in the guide might fit for the person who wrote them, but they may not necessarily fit for Zach "because that's me. When he's teaching it, maybe it's a whole different story. And I just have to go from there" (Z15.12).

Zach emphasized the importance of helping students develop skills and one of the skills he felt was most important was the ability to communicate.

> And that's the key is communication. If you can't tell somebody else what's up there in your mind, what good is it? You can know everything in the world, but you have to let somebody know you know it or make something happen with what you do know or what good is it? So you have to know how to communicate. (Z15.9)

Zach saw communication as an integral part of the Social Studies curriculum. "It is all entwined. Social, the word social means people. People communicate. Communication, English, same thing" (Z15.8).

As a university course assignment Zach chose to develop a resource manual on Japan collaboratively with a classmate. Zach found co-authoring the resource manual was a very satisfying experience. He described this experience in his journal in the following way:

> Working with Nancy added an extra incentive, an increased motivation to do a good job. Somebody else was counting on me to do my part. I'm not saying that the project wouldn't have gotten done if I had had to do it by

> myself, but with Nancy, I really enjoyed working on it and together, we did a better job. (February 7,1992)

While Zach had previously seen himself as someone who helped others, and in doing so also helped himself, he had been hesitant to seek help from others. He now saw increasing value in allowing others to help him out because "you don't have the answers so you appreciate when somebody else helps you out with some of the answers or some of the possible answers" (Z15.12). Thus people as well as materials became valuable resources. When a woman from the National Film Board (NFB) showed previews of several films during his Teaching Methods class and left the students with a resource list, Zach wrote, "This is great! Somebody else has done the hard work for me. All the pertinent films that NFB has have been listed for me: sort of a short list of their collection" (January 29, 1992).

When Zach was collecting resources for the Japan unit he was preparing, he "stopped by the Japanese Consulate to get a teaching package for Japan. Then I went to the Office of Multiculturalism and got another package. I think it is almost an information overload. I'm not complaining though; the stuff I got is priceless" (January 31, 1992). Zach was not only impressed with the information itself, but also "the helpfulness of the two offices has impressed me greatly. The job of teaching is made less frantic knowing that there are places out there that want to help. All we have to do as teachers is open our eyes and ears and find them" (January 31, 1992).

Finale (February to April, 1992)

During this time Zach developed a sense of his own integrity as a teacher and his voice of authority spoke from both narrative and paradigmatic knowing. He began to realize "you cannot try something that you don't think will work for you because if you don't think it's going to work it's definitely not going to work. It has to be very individualized" (Z21.14). He was encouraged by Anne to construct his own ways of doing what was required by the curriculum and he was able to encourage students to develop their own voices of authority within the classroom community.

Zach began to work his way in gradually. "I'm watching her do it once and then I take it over" (Z17.3). Zach was aware of what the university required as far as the amount he should be teaching and was pleased he was being given enough teaching time in the classroom. Zach valued this time to get more experience and to try new things and the more opportunity he got, the better he liked it. Being given more teaching time also allowed Zach to believe that Anne had faith in his abilities. Zach valued this practicum as a

time to try things he thought would work for him. Zach continued to reconstruct his narrative knowing and began to author his own version of teaching.

> Nobody can give you the format you're going to use. They can give you a format to try and they can give you something that might work for them but there is no guarantee that it will work for you. You have to build your own confidence. You have to rely on yourself because in the end you're the only one there to catch you. It's got to be you. (Z21.14)

Zach's narrative knowing gave him confidence to assume more responsibility than in his previous practicum. "There were still restrictions and there always will be but I was making many of the decisions that had to be made. I wasn't waiting for someone else to make them for me" (Z22.15). While he believed Anne had provided room for him to grow as she stepped aside and allowed him to take over, she was also there with support if he needed it. "She was there just in case. Not standing over me, but close enough that she could come in" (Z22.15).

Anne's ability to draw Zach's ideas out by listening and questioning helped him expand and clarify his own knowing as he explained himself to her. "She was questioning it. I sensed that she was unsure about what I was planning to do. But then I explained myself. I had my framework. I had thought it out" (Z21.6). As Zach began to try his own ideas, Anne encouraged him to do things his own way. "She trusts me" (Z21.6). In this way she enabled Zach to develop confidence in his abilities. At times Zach found her approach frustrating. "At times I sit there and I think and say, 'Oh, she's not doing anything. She's not doing a thing here'" (Z21.4). The authorized version of teaching he accepted led him to expect more guidance from her. "I'm in practicum and she's supposed to be guiding me, evaluating me and everything" (Z21.4). However, the more she left him to make his own choices, the more Zach began to take ownership of his own learning and of the classes he taught. "If you really sit back and look, yeah, she's doing it all. But she's letting me do it by myself at the same time so she's there. She's that helpful hand that's always there but you don't know she's there" (Z21.4). This experience gave him a new version of teaching to think about as he began to construct new stories of himself as a teacher.

As Zach continued to construct his narrative knowing of teaching, Anne helped him focus on spaces where questions could emerge rather than focusing on the answers. "She'd ask the right questions and I ask those questions of myself now when I'm thinking of something new, you know. What's going to happen here?" (Z21.4/5). In this way she helped him expand his understanding as he looked for spaces within the framework he had

designed. "It seems like she totally planned it out so perfectly to manipulate me into the right situation where I thought of it myself" (Z21.3/4). Anne began to leave Zach more and more on his own. The more she trusted him, the more he trusted his own decisions.

Zach described how interactions with students helped him learn. "You open up and suddenly they make you clarify things that have gaps. Like what Anne was doing to me. It happens from both ends, when I'm learning something. It also happens when I'm teaching something so in the end, it's all the same" (Z21.18). Zach began to see himself as learning to teach from his students in the following way:

> I learn how to teach from them. They're the ones receiving so they're the ones asking for clarifications to make sure they know what they're receiving. If it's all spotty, then they're not getting anything so it's up to them to tell me what they need. I'll start it, and they have to ask me to fill in the gaps. (Z21.18/19)

By the time Zach had completed four weeks of his final eight week practicum, he began to see the classroom as his own. "It's changed now. It's my classroom. Because she's allowed me so much freedom" (Z21.3/4). At this time, Zach needed to leave his practicum placement for a one week callback session at the university. Anne reinforced Zach's sense that it was his class. "She said, since they were my classes and she would only have them for a few days, she didn't want to deviate from the direction I had set out" (March 6, 1992). Zach prepared the lesson plans and activities for Anne to carry out while he was gone since she had asked him to "make me a copy of your lesson plans and I'll go with your thing because this is your class. The second you come back it's yours" (Z19.5).

Zach had Anne sit in and observe him teach the Health lesson he wanted her to teach to other classes while he was gone. This was similar to the way Anne initially introduced him to teaching her classes. Zach had chosen a "safe day" plan (Craig, 1992) with everything set out so Anne would know exactly what to do. While he had chosen a movie on substance abuse for Health, Social Studies required more detailed planning. Zach told me, "She's going to follow exactly what I'm doing. It's actually really nice because it's almost like a lesson made for a sub. The movie is, the rest of it, some of it is going to require a lot more, she needs exact lesson plans" (Z19.6).

After the university callback, Anne continued to support Zach's ideas and his confidence in his authority by showing an interest in the new things he was trying.

> I am planning a debate with the nines in Health and I spent some time tonight writing it up. Anne has expressed an interest in it and has said she may use the format I have prepared in the future. As well, she is thinking about video taping the debates to use as a teaching tool for future classes.

> The attention that this debate is receiving is a real ego booster since I am the sole producer of the idea. I'm feeling more and more like a real teacher. (April 7, 1992)

As Zach progressed through his practicum, he became better able to structure activities which allowed for more student input. In Social Studies, Zach had students design, administer, and analyze a questionnaire on technology. "I divided the class into groups and had them each make up five questions that they could ask someone in their communities about the effects of technology on them" (March 2, 1992). In this way he was able to make spaces for his students to use their narrative knowing of technology to fulfil the curriculum requirements. "Once their group summaries were complete (written on big sheets of newsprint), I put those sheets on the wall so each group could see what the others had come up with. I handed out new question sheets and together we came up with one or two sentences summaries of each question which they then wrote on to their sheets" (March 2, 1992).

Zach had made space for the voices of his students within the curriculum in the technology assignment and was able to acknowledge his students as capable of creating appropriate questions. I was again struck by the way Zach's teaching paralleled his own learning. As he learned to value his ability to question, he began to value his students' ability to question as well. "They're happy and it really makes a difference because, I don't know, you're seeing things happening" (Z19.1).

Zach did not struggle as much with trying to impose the curriculum on students but was developing the ability to draw the voices and ideas of his students into the curriculum. The following Health lesson Zach constructed made me realize how dramatically his ability to make space for students' voices had changed since the standardized worksheet format he felt compelled to use in his French practicum.

Zach had students work in groups to design skits to show how they would use certain assertiveness techniques to deal with various situations. Zach was required to cover the concept of substance abuse. After watching a film on second hand smoke and discussing assertiveness techniques students could use to help them say no and deal with others who were imposing on them, Zach divided the classes into groups to create role plays of various scenarios he provided. The students were given ten minutes to organize their role plays and then the presentations began. Zach was initially unsure how to evaluate the diversity of the role plays fairly. He decided to design a Likert type scale around four criteria. He reminded students to "think about the criteria when you're putting this together because that's what it's going to be graded on" (Z20.12). One member from each observing group evaluated the presentations. Each student evaluated at least one

presentation. Zach then took in all the evaluations and averaged his in with the students' evaluations to get a final mark.

Zach placed even more emphasis on having students interact with each other after his university callback session. Hearing about other student teachers' experiences was very beneficial and he began to realize the importance of having time to interact with others in the same situation as yourself. "The real benefit of the callback was the interaction among the group. I was listening to and talking to people who were in the same situation I was in" (March 12, 1992). This connected with the way Zach wanted students to interact in his classes. After the callback, Zach designed a written assignment involving small group rather than whole class interaction. "It was a different way of brainstorming. I didn't have it as the class as a whole. The kids were helping each other brainstorm. It was paragraph writing and we had to get the content" (Z21.6). Zach asked students to "break down all the points that you think apply to the question the paragraph's going to answer from that chapter" (Z21.6) as a homework assignment. When students came to class the next day, Zach asked them to "'pull out your piece of paper that you've written all these points on, read it to yourself. Remind yourself of all the points. Now, pass it to the person behind you. You've got a sheet in front of you now. Read it. Write down any points that you have that you think they missed but at the same time they're also sparking points that you missed, right.' And I did that three times so three different sets of eyes saw the paper and wrote on that paper and 'Ok, back to the original. Read what was written'" (Z21.6). Students then wrote their individual paragraphs "and it just worked really well" (Z21.6). The assignment made space for all students to listen and respond to others in their group. Zach saw this assignment as one in which students could gain ideas from other students in a quiet and orderly fashion. Zach described this activity as "a written conversation because I didn't want everybody talking" (Z21.7). Zach authored the assignment from his own narrative knowing. "I thought of that idea on callback because I knew I was going to be doing this paragraph and I was sitting there, and I don't know where I got that idea from. It just suddenly, that will work. But I don't know where it came from because I don't think I read anything, maybe I read something along the lines, but I've never read anything like that" (Z21.7).

Book II: Making it Happen

Stories are not only told; they are also lived. MacIntyre (1981) tells us we are at the same time authors and actors. In this book I focus on ways Zach lived the stories he had learned and was learning to tell as he progressed along the path toward his goal of becoming a teacher. At times Zach was the main character in stories he authored. At times he played a role in stories he felt were authored for him. At times he felt he was the main character in stories he was not sure how to author.

Prelude (May to August, 1991)

One of the first things Zach said to me as I tried to explain why I was taking so long to write my proposal was, "That's not an excuse, it's a means of doing it. It doesn't matter how you do it, as long as you get done in the end. If it works for you, keep doing it" (Z1.1). Zach described how each person has his/her own way of doing things. We each should author our own lives as long as we do not infringe on the rights of others. Rules are necessary in a society so individuals do not infringe on the rights of others. However, Zach was concerned that those in power set the rules. "It's one of those necessary evils of life because it's always going to be there. There's always going to be somebody on top of the other person" (Z4.9/10). Zach was struggling with trying to figure out the best way for individuals to author their lives while living within the authorized societal versions. He often emphasized to me the rights of individuals as well as the difficulty he had with some people being "dominant" (Z4.9/10) over others. While Zach believed there were certain basic human rights, positions of authority needed to be earned. "The dominance should come from I am better or I am better at this because I have done all these things. I have earned it" (Z4.9/10).

Zach told me individuals should have the right to succeed and the right to fail regardless of their "position." He had written a paper on the importance of equality of opportunity since equality of condition was not possible. Zach described how everyone has certain basic rights and anything else should be earned by merit. "You have the right to live and, I don't know, depending on the country, you just have the right not to be murdered and all that kind of stuff. And what you do from there is your own account and that's where all these ideas are coming from so that's sort of in the back of my head" (Z1.9).

Zach wrote a history paper refuting the thesis that Europe rose to world dominance because they were better than other nations. He described Europe's rise to dominance as being a particular combination of circumstances that happened to fall in place at that time. He told me Europe's dominance was similar to the classroom bully. "Everybody else is happy on their own and they're content, and they're moving forward in their own speed and whatever they feel like. The classroom bully decides he wants to do it for everybody and they're going to do it his way, right. That's what Europe was" (Z1.7). Zach was concerned about the imposition of dominance on a global level because "if it continues, it'll be the end of the world" (Z1.7).

As he imagined himself in his own classroom, Zach assumed he would need to be the leader, the dominant person. "I can see my position because of the institution, I can see my position being the dominant one and I don't have a problem with that because there must be a leader somewhere and the institution decides it's going to be me" (Z4.11). While he saw himself as needing to be dominant over his students, he wanted to earn this authority from his students rather than impose it on them.

We talked about the way Machiavelli gained power as well as the way Martin Luther was able to change the rules by questioning them and coming up with "something better." While Zach imagined he needed to fit into the existing power structure of "the institution" (Z4.16), he believed it was possible to make changes as long as he could justify them. "Just do it your own way because you know it's right, but know why it's right. You must be able to back yourself up. Why is your way better than the other way? And if you can back all that up, do it and face the consequences" (Z4.16).

Zach described to me how life is made up of a variety of situations and it was important to be able to fit into as many different situations as possible. He believed he needed to fit himself into the situation because "it's easier for one person to change himself than for an entire event to change itself to you" (Z4.5). Zach described each situation as a kind of game where the people in power set the rules. His job as a player was to figure out the rules. As situations changed, so did the rules. Since being an education student was a situation Zach had chosen to be in, he had to understand the particular rules he would be expected to follow in order to fit in. He explained that "everybody has to live within a compromise. This is the compromise I have chosen to live in and since I've chosen to live here, I have to live by the rules" (Z3.8).

Although Zach did not like some of the rules, he did not believe it was his place to question them until he understood them. Once he understood the authorized versions and why they were necessary, he could begin to author his own versions.

> The only way you can do anything, either for or against something is to become part of it. You must play by the rules before you can break the rules. And if you want to understand it, first of all you have to find out what the societal norm is for understanding that. Because you can't say somebody else is wrong until you find out what they're thinking, right. And why they're thinking it. Because maybe they are right. So you have to play by the rules. You have to get into it. (Z4.17)

However, at this point, he was still trying to figure out what rules were involved in the authorized versions of the university game.

Chapter One (September to mid November, 1991)

Zach described life as a game in which the rules are written and rewritten by those in authority. While Zach could author his own narrative of experience in his teacher education program, he needed to choose from the authorized scripts set out for him. For Zach to be able to participate successfully in the versions of teacher education authored at the university, he needed to figure out how he was expected to play the games being written for him.

Zach told me that the game changes as situations change. Each game has a goal and the goal for this particular game was the degree which would allow Zach to become a teacher. "There's an end goal in everything that you do and in order to get to that goal, you must follow the boundaries, the rules, the path, whatever you want to call it, that is set out by whoever controls that end goal" (Z8.14).

Zach believed his university instructors had particular expert knowledge he would need to become a good teacher. "I'm not an expert on this. I don't know what's necessary and what isn't and I'll find out later" (Z8.14). He felt it was necessary to play by the rules until he had the opportunity to experience the whole program. He felt very strongly that he had no right to judge his program until he became a practising teacher. "Then I can consider myself more knowledgeable and render an opinion. But until I've done it, finished this little exercise called a degree, I can't render an opinion because I don't know anything about it" (Z8.14).

In order to become a teacher, Zach was willing to play a variation of what Elbow (1981) calls the "believing game" where we try to enter into another's way of thinking. "I don't agree with everything that goes on here, but I have to understand it. Once I understand it, then I can start to change it" (Z6.28).

One rule Zach described was the selection of required courses by the university. "Everybody has to have a general studies option and I'm trying to figure out where this is useful but it doesn't really matter why, if I can figure it out or not. It's just necessary so

there's part of the game" (Z8.14). Since the general studies option could be "anywhere from the university" (Z8.14), Zach wondered "why can't it be anywhere from life? I've done a lot, why can't I get three credits for being in the army? It's part of the rules. I have to play by the rules so I follow them" (Z8.14). This rule made little sense to Zach. "No rhyme or reason for it that I can see. I'm sure there is one someplace or there originally was one" (Z8.14).

Zach described how, at the university, the boundaries are set by the course content and by the professor's area of expertise. "Since the course calls for this particular piece of knowledge to be installed into the student's mind, and if that student's venturing too far, the instructor will more than likely pull you back in and say 'This is what you have to learn. Leave that alone'" (Z8.5). Within each course Zach experienced implicit boundaries set by his instructors. He described a professor's area of expertise as tied to his or her particular belief system "otherwise that instructor never would have done his doctorate in that thing because that's what he believes is right" (Z8.4). Zach would need to acknowledge these values and stay within those boundaries in order to get a good evaluation. "So, while you may introduce some of the other areas you're in, the final word is always going to be in that area of the instructor's expertise. So you have to stay within the boundaries. Don't venture too far because you're going to get your fingers slapped" (Z8.4). For Zach, getting your fingers slapped meant getting a poor mark.

Zach believed the teacher's role in class was to be an expert who holds a particular body of professional knowledge. Therefore, as a student, Zach needed to avoid "uncharted knowledge" (Z8.5). It would be inappropriate for Zach to construct new knowledge to contribute to class because "nobody's going to be an expert on that and you're suddenly placing the instructor at risk because he's no longer the expert in whatever you're trying to get into" (Z8.5). It would be disrespectful to publicly challenge his teachers' knowledge as this would challenge their authority. Thus Zach was able to expand his own knowing only within what he perceived were the boundaries preset by others.

The course content also set up boundaries and it was Zach's job to figure out where he stood within the parameters set for him. "The content material, the major topics are set by the course. But how you're going to <u>think</u> about them and how you're going to deal with them, are not set by the course. It's set by yourself" (Z8.6). Zach believed it was up to him to choose the versions he wished to author as a teacher. The institutional versions were helping him think about the versions he would be accountable for living. "[The course] is forcing you to take a stand, find out where you are, because that's the key, is

knowing where you stand. The reason for a lot of these courses now is to show you the two outside boundaries" (Z8.6).

At times the outside boundaries set by course assignments created dichotomies inconsistent with Zach's narrative knowing. For example, Zach had "trouble" with the distinction between teacher centered and student centered lessons "because no lesson is one or the other" (Z6.3). However, Zach was accountable to his university instructors for the way he chose to author the lessons. "As for my demonstration with the saddle, a lot of it is going to be demonstration. Teacher oriented. But there will be some involvement where I will be pulling students in so it's not totally teacher oriented. So, am I going to lose marks for that? I have to question on that because I don't like the fact that I do one or the other. They're both together" (Z6.3). I began to see the tension created when Zach felt required to author a story of his own to fit a version constructed by someone else.

While Zach was beginning to figure out how to play the authorized versions of teacher education at the university, he knew the rules would be different in the versions he would need to play in the schools. "I'm starting to understand the rules of this institution, but that will be a whole new institution" (Z6.27). Zach imagined that in the school, the game would still be one of acknowledging the values of the existing system and of adding his own ideas carefully. He knew he would need to fit into the authorized versions in order to be accepted as a member of the teaching community.

> You have to get used to that school's rules, not so much the school's rules, but that individual's rules for doing things and the way they do things because they are the ones that are writing up your evaluation. So you have to be, yes, trying new things, to a point. But you must be following their way of doing things in order to appear like a good teacher because the way they teach is the way they figure is the right way to teach. So you must incorporate some of their things into your way, some of their methods into your way of teaching. At least for that particular exercise because that's the way you're going to get a good evaluation. (Z8.3)

Zach imagined once he became a teacher it would be his responsibility to set the rules within his own classroom "and it's a big responsibility so they're giving me a little bit of background on why and what reasoning I should be looking at when I do set my rules" (Z8.15). Zach believed one of the things he was learning from his courses was "how to be a little bit more flexible or things that are a little bit different than what they used to look for as in the traditional teaching they used to do" (Z8.15).

Zach believed he would have freedom to author new versions of teaching within his own classroom. However, in order to change authorized versions within the larger educational community, he would first need to move up in the educational hierarchy. "In

my classroom, in my little world, I can change. But if I want to carry on and change a few of the other worlds, being the other classrooms, then I must move upward. But in order to get to that position you must play by the existing rules. You can't change the rules until you have the power to do so" (Z7.11).

While Zach believed he needed to have a large body of content knowledge in order to succeed as a teacher, he did not believe he could preplan the actual teaching situation ahead of time. "Like prethink some of the possibilities, but you can't decide we're going to do it this way today before you find out what's happening today. Where everybody's at, you know. Maybe somebody's father died last night, something that's going to change everything. You cannot predestine where you're going" (Z7.20/21). Zach knew teaching required more narrative knowledge. "You just have to rely on the fact that you have a fairly good sense and you just pay attention to what's happening and rely on your prior experience and . . . I don't know, knowledge. Instinct. Instinct plays a big part" (Z7.1). I found it interesting that while Zach placed a high value on his previous experience, he could not include this in what he had learned to value as "knowledge." He seemed to have learned well the lessons of objective positivism. "So you just have to deal with it as it happens and then use that. Suddenly that will be logged in as prior experience and the next time something happens that possibly is close to that, or slightly different, you'll be able to relay back to that" (Z7.1).

While Zach believed he could not predetermine how a classroom situation would be lived out, he had learned in his university classes that it was necessary to have some procedures and expectations set out ahead of time. "If there's nothing set up before hand, the students don't know what to do and it's every man for himself and that creates problems" (Z10.6). As a teacher Zach would need to find his own balance between paradigmatic expectations and contextual flexibility. "They're pretty big on preplanned rules and procedures but, they're also at the same point saying don't have too many of them. Have a few" (Z10.6).

While Zach believed he was learning a variety of procedures and strategies to use in his future teaching, he felt "there is no method of doing it. You'll call the situations as you see them because every situation will be different and it would be wrong to try and set up some method" (Z6.13). Since each situation would be different Zach could not go in with a predetermined assessment of what the situation would be like. One of his favorite expressions was, "Don't explain it, just do it" (Z7.22). It was the particular situation that would determine whether his actions were appropriate. "Everything that we do can be good in one situation and bad in another. So you have to learn to read the situation" (Z6.11). However, the narrative knowing Zach used in "learning to read" the situation

was not an explicit part of Zach's teacher education program nor part of what he explicitly planned to teach his students.

Zach saw his university courses as a way to become more aware of a variety of possibilities for teaching. "That's the key to a lot of teaching. There is no set way. As long as you're aware. Aware of the different possibilities. As soon as you're aware of them, then suddenly they fall into place" (Z6.13).

The university was the place where Zach would learn and the school was the place where he would do what he had learned. "Once I learn how to make lesson plans, and I learn how to do it proficiently, or at least what I consider to be proficiently, it'll be there. I won't have to learn how to do it again. Suddenly, all that learning time is erased" (Z8.13). Zach believed he needed to learn about teaching before he began teaching. "You have to learn someplace. This is the place. And everything takes time" (Z8.13). Zach described university as a place where "time is not a factor" (Z8.12). He could "put in whatever time it takes" (Z8.12) to figure out the best way of doing things. He knew that "once you're out teaching, you don't have that time" (Z8.12).

Zach imagined teaching would be more like doing things at home. "I think more realistically because it's no longer something abstract. It's got to be dealt with. It's got to happen. You have to do it the most practical way. You can't always go for the best way. You have to deal with everything and that's what's going to happen when I start teaching" (Z8.11). At university "you don't worry about the most practical way. You worry about the best way" (Z8.11). Zach appreciated having experience in schools and saw the university as providing a gradual immersion into the school situation. "I like the way they're doing it. Because they're placing us in that world. They're placing us for short periods of time into that world so we can start making reality of it" (Z10.14).

As Zach imagined himself as a teacher, he believed he would need to draw the students in, stimulate their interests in what he was required to teach. "If they don't somehow get drawn in, there will be no interest. You have to connect with them and in order to connect with them you must be allowing them their own participation" (Z7.7).

After watching a video tape of examples of good teaching Zach told me that "the major qualities that they all <u>had</u> was not one of them asked a student to do something that he or she wouldn't do themselves really. Like when they say 'do this' they led the way, role models you know" (Z6.4). Perhaps his belief in the importance of modelling led him to choose "demonstration" as the teaching technique he wanted to try first. While the purpose was "to demonstrate that I know what a demonstration is" (Z6.1), Zach concentrated on finding content he believed would be relevant for his student peers. Zach decided to draw from his narrative knowing of ballroom dancing and teach the class how

to do the rumba. Demonstrating the rumba fit with his belief that "you have to show them. You have to model it for them" (Z6.5). It also fit with his belief that learning must be relevant and useful in his students' present lives. He imagined if the students believed what he was teaching them was useful. "Suddenly there's a purpose, you know. It's just not something trivial. It's something they might be interested in" (Z6.2).

Preparing a peer teaching lesson in his French minor was a different story. Because Zach wanted this lesson, as well as his others, to be relevant and useful to his students, he did not want to teach isolated words. He imagined the lesson he had chosen fitting into the middle of the teaching year. "I'm trying to stick a hypothetical class that belongs in the middle, to the beginning" (Z9.14). Taking the lesson out of context did not make sense. "And that's why it's so hard because in this hypothetical situation, none of the students have anything established. [They do not have] this established knowledge that I'm expecting them to have" (Z9.14). Zach knew the Grade 7 French curriculum started with a unit on questioning, but did not see that as useful in isolation. How could he teach one 15 minute lesson that would give his students enough French to be useful to them and still be student centered? "It's just really difficult. It'll be a lot easier when you start a class from day one to the end. Then you work into it. And once you get to that point, and you know what they know then you've already set your standard and it'll be a lot easier" (Z9.14). Zach's comments made me aware of how strongly he implicitly valued not only his own narrative knowing, but the shared classroom history that was necessary for an educative situation to develop.

Chapter Two (mid-November to Mid-December, 1991)

Zach described life in general and the curriculum in particular as a path. This analogy helped Zach make sense of what was happening. He described this path as a direction you chose to follow "but you haven't been on it yet so it can't be already there. It's a direction and whatever you do, is your path" (Z14.34). In some ways he imagined that we are all on the same path, the path of life.

> It's the path of life, it's the same path. It's not that different. We all hit the same stage. We all are trying to achieve generally the same things. Not the same job or whatever but we all want to live, we all want to live comfortably. We all have the same goals. Some to a higher extent than others and possibly different ideas of what success is. But we have the idea of success and it's just our nature to go for it. Now, if it's easier for us to go for it or harder, that's education. (Z14.31)

As a teacher, it was Zach's job to help students move along the path and learn how to make choices "and whatever you follow, whatever you do is your path. You can't go off that path" (Z14.34). However, the way the path unfolded would be different for each individual. "The context is different. But it can be different yet still similar" (Z14.31).

Zach was authoring his life on this path as well. "I'm just at a point. Because I'm on that path too. Because my path doesn't stop until the end as we know it" (Z14.30). He saw his role as a teacher "to help these people make an easier path. Make it a little bit simpler to walk along that path. Whatever path you happen to choose" (Z14.30). Zach began to believe that as a teacher, it was important for him to look back in order to help students move along the path. "And I have to start doing it more often because that's what a teacher is all about" (Z14.29). Zach would need to be aware of the steps he had taken if he was going to help his students.

> You have to isolate individual steps that you went through to get where you are, to get that knowledge that you're trying to give to them because you're not there to give them the end, the cure, the true answer. You're there to help bring them along, following behind you in the same footsteps you followed, you did. They're not going to be the same foot steps. They're going to be a different size, slightly different path but similar, generally the same. (Z14.29)

As a teacher, the curriculum became the path within the school context. "It's what I must follow" (Z14.14/15). The way in which Zach followed the curriculum path would depend on him and his students. "It's like they give you the raw material, like the students and whatever knowledge you have in your mind and you're supposed to come up with the finished project, product. The method is all up to you" (Z14.14/15).

The ways in which Zach actually moved along the curriculum path were filled with narrative tensions and difficulties. The speed with which he had to move along the path in order to cover the required curriculum ground was a continual frustration. "I watch my time, and I'm trying to keep up and there's so many things that I want to do and I just can't" (Z11.7). Zach was often torn between the time students needed to do assignments well and the amount of material he wanted to cover. "Like when you're doing an *ecoute*, because it is listening, and you have to say it twice and you have to do it slow enough that they can get the response down otherwise they're not learning anything. So you have to give them enough time to answer. And because of that, I ended up running short today and I didn't take the marks in" (Z11.7).

While Zach did not want to take time away from the curriculum content to deal with classroom management, he sometimes found this necessary in order to keep the class

moving. "I took two minutes to explain because I probably would have lost a lot more than two minutes if I would have let things keep going the way they were" (Z11.8). Zach wanted to move through the "required" curriculum as quickly as possible so he and the students would have time to do some of the group projects that would provide a more individualistic and creative focus to supplement the required curriculum.

> I want to shoot for a unit exam then so that they'll all be done and then I can get into this, well I want to get into this big project, and before that having them write up a script and that because it's good review. Because I want them to use everything they can out of that unit that they've done in order to come up with these scripts right. And then they write the final exam, after they're done all this work on the script. And then film it quickly. Then time's up. (Z11.15)

Not only was there not enough time for Zach to cover the prescribed curriculum with the whole class, but "each one has their own individual speed. I can't do that. Not with 30 students. It's impossible" (Z14.2). While Zach realized each student progressed at a different pace, he believed the curriculum content needed to be introduced to students by himself. The only way he could imagine this happening was to teach it by telling it to the students through whole class lecture. "You can't have 30 different lectures in that class, because each student is actually progressing at a different pace. But it's not physically possible for me to lecture 30 different lectures to 30 different students because it takes 30 minutes to do a lecture, to teach a new concept" (Z14.2). This was a continual tension as Zach tried to move fast enough to challenge the better students yet slow enough so that he did not lose the slower ones. "Now, this is what is expected, according to the curriculum, so I introduce that. If they all know that, then I introduce the next one and I keep going until they get to a rate where I'm starting to lose too many of them. But I have to go for the norm" (Z14.3).

Since there was a particular body of knowledge that had to be transmitted to all students, Zach told me it would be "physically impossible to teach each student individually" (Z14.3). For Zach, individualizing instruction would mean covering the same curriculum ground with each student, but at different paces. Thus, individualized instruction made no sense.

> You could take them aside, but when? There's not enough minutes in the day to teach what you have to teach now. Where are you going to find all this extra time to throw on another day within that same day? Where you're going to take aside all these other students who actually should be pushed. And then you can't only have them because then you're only looking to the needs of two groups. Your medium group and that. What about your slow ones? You've got to take them aside too. Where? When? (Z14.3)

Planning was an important means of helping Zach keep moving along the curriculum path because "you know what you're doing and things can't knock you off" (Z11.13/14). Having a script helped Zach "get to your goal. Your goal being your objectives. You want this and this done according to this method" (Z11.13/14). Being well planned prevented Zach from getting lost in classroom contingencies. "We're going to change it here and here because this happens and this happens. But you at least know where you're heading" (Z11.13/14).

Helping students involved, in part, teaching them to do things right so that they could avoid the mistakes of others. Zach saw his role of French teacher as one of teaching the rules and concepts to students so that they would be able to put them together correctly, to make appropriate choices. "There's rules. It's very logical, very sequential. You build on those rules. And then you start to take the rules apart and put things together in different ways, but you need the basic rules to start" (Z14.4). Here again Zach's beliefs about teaching paralleled his narrative valuing of paradigmatic rules.

His obligation as a teacher was to show his students how to follow the rules so that they could do it right. He felt strongly that allowing students to explore blindly on their own was miseducative. He struggled to articulate what he believed comprised the consequences of miseducative experience. "You don't start doing something better if you keep doing it wrong. Maybe you learn to get worse at it. You have to be taught the right way" (Z14.5).

Zach saw his role as helping students learn by giving them "the things to think with." He imagined learning to be a linear path "because it all builds on each other. If you don't know this, you can't do that" (Z14.1). This became a real dilemma for Zach when the students moved past the prescribed curriculum he had taught through standardized worksheets to doing more individualized projects. He was amazed at the diversity and creativity students presented in the project work. Many were attempting things far beyond what Zach or his cooperating teacher, Pat, had taught. "This is far beyond them. They don't even touch this stuff until Grade 10" (Z14.1). Zach imagined they might have learned from "a few immersion students so they're getting smarter without even realizing it" (Z14.1). While Zach was pleased with the students' ability and initiative, he was also concerned when students moved into areas he had not yet reached in the curriculum. "My problem is when they start getting into verbs, tenses and stuff that they don't understand. They're going to build bad habits if they do it wrong" (Z14.2).

The diversity in the projects made evaluation very difficult for Zach. He wanted to give students credit for trying new things that were beyond what he had covered, but he

did not feel this would be fair to others who had not moved ahead of him on the curriculum path. He was aware that many students were straining to move faster while many were struggling to keep up. "The thing is you have to stifle them, unfortunately, because you can't, you can't push too far ahead because there are some that have no idea what's going on" (Z14.1). This created a dilemma as Zach felt it was necessary to keep the students moving at the same pace. "You have to find that medium. And, with a class of more than five students, you have no choice but to find a medium. You can't teach everyone everything according to their pace. It's just not possible" (Z14.2).

Having no narrative connection with the ways in which Pat and her students had already covered some of the curriculum made it difficult to begin his practicum in the middle of the school year "because you don't know what they've done" (Z14.8). Preparing exams for students was difficult when Zach did not really know where the students were at. "Walking in becomes a real problem, like part of the exam I put together. [Pat] had a few things she wanted put on there and I never taught that to the kids and I was really struggling with how to put it together" (Z13.14).

In order to "make things happen," Zach needed to have a clear sense of what he wanted to happen. During the first week of his practicum he was overwhelmed. His initial unspoken question seemed to be "What's happening?" as he tried to make sense of the junior high six day schedule that was divided into numerous 45 minute periods each bringing in a new wave of unfamiliar faces. "When I walked in on Monday and I was sitting there, Oh God, and it was overload. I couldn't keep everything straight but now things are starting to fall into paths and I'm starting to see it" (Z11.6). He initially focused his attention on the monthly timetable schedule that would help him figure out when things would happen. As he began to understand what was happening he told me, "As I get more comfortable it's getting easier. The work is not getting any less, but it's becoming more rote memory, you're just doing it, making it happen. I have to think too much right now, but it'll become easier, so it won't take quite as long or it won't be quite as mind boggling or draining" (Z11.5).

Zach seemed to imagine teaching as presenting students with the information they needed to know, structuring activities that would enable students to practise what he had taught them, and then allowing them to be accountable for their own learning by doing the assignments in ways that worked for them. He began to plan isolated lessons for the various 45 minute instructional blocks with separate lessons for each class. He soon saw this as a waste of time. "I have to cross that one out, I never had time today. This happened, cross that one out, but I can throw that one into the next class" (Z11.14). He began to notice "massive differences" in the classes and devised a system for keeping track

of what had been covered in each class in order to be able to start where he left off with each particular class. "You have to know where you are because all of a sudden, did you guys do this, or didn't you, you know. You have to make meticulous notes. So, my notetaking is getting better" (Z11.14).

Zach began to appreciate the value of being well planned, something Pat had stressed as important. "I'm tired. It was my own stupidity. It was my lapse. I thought I knew where I was going. But when I sat down, and started doing it, I realized how much more had to go into it. I was up until 2 o'clock this morning. But I wasn't going to go to bed until I knew what I was doing because I wasn't going to try and fake my way through it" (Z11.13). Once Zach had his plans on paper, they gave him a sense of security. He described how his plans reminded him of what should be happening. "It's written down. This is the way it's supposed to be. Suddenly, you know what you're doing and things can't knock you off" (Z11.13). Zach described how when something unexpected happened, he felt more comfortable dealing with it when he had his written plan to pull him back on course. "It made the things move smoothly today. Things were going the way I wanted them to go. Yes, there were minor problems here or there, but they were minor. Like they don't bother you when you know where you're going. You just quickly make a U turn around it and keep going so I'm happy I did all this" (Z11.9). Since Zach had no narrative knowing of planning curriculum stories from a teacher's perspective, he needed to write detailed scripts of how he was going to live the curriculum path story in the classroom. Once he had lived the stories, he imagined his planning would not need to be so detailed. "Pat's been teaching for five years now and she says she's got it all in her head. She's done this a couple of times and she's starting to know" (Z11.9).

What Zach had learned at university were textbook examples that could not be transferred to classroom situations. "Procedures don't work. Combinations of things work with situations. Gut feeling works. Out of a book, you can't do it" (Z12.4). He believed it was up to him during his practicum to make things happen within particular situations. "Make it happen. Know all the theories, but all of that is just going to be background knowledge when you're up there. You are the one that's making things happen. Not the theories. You've got to call it as you see it" (Z12.5).

Zach valued learning from his practicum situations. Each experience gave him something new to draw on in future situations. "It worked for that time. But, if I try it again in a different situation, it may not work. And that's where you get this filing cabinet in your mind of different things you can do" (Z14.25). Zach's narrative knowing of teaching gave him a collection of contextualized examples he could draw from as particular situations led him to recall past memories he could adapt to present situations.

Zach described how he was beginning to see the value in thinking back on his own experience. He had said earlier "Don't explain it. Just do it" (Z7.22). Now he began to value thinking as a way to accomplish something as he began to connect the thinking with the doing. "But thinking about it is doing it too. It's the same thing. It's become part of that 'Do it.' Think about it, make whatever changes you want to make, it's all part of the 'Do it' now. It's not so much that my 'Do it' has changed, but that it's grown to include reflecting and thinking about it" (Z14.21). Zach began to see that "going around in circles" could be beneficial although "there's still a lot of it that's just a pure waste of time" (Z14.16). Reflective circles were valuable only when they led to definite changes. "If there's definite changes happening then it's not a waste of time and you're not going in circles if the changes are happening" (Z14.16/17).

Zach initially focused on what he wanted the students to learn and expected that how it would happen would take care of itself. There were times when he was pleased with what happened and times when he was not. At times he described classes as humming along and others where the students were starting to push him. Zach became frustrated when he did not sense that things were happening.

One incident in particular stands out for me. Zach described a time when his lesson was not moving along smoothly because several students were not paying attention. "I knew what was happening wasn't good and it wasn't what I expected to happen, it wasn't positive. So I didn't know what to do" (Z14.24). Zach stopped teaching, leaned back on his desk, and did nothing. He told me he did not know what else to do. Since nothing was happening in the lesson, he stopped to see what would happen. "It just seemed right for me to stop. Because what I was doing wasn't useful. Like there was no use in me continuing on because nobody was getting it, so I would have to redo it anyway so it was a waste of my time" (Z14.23). Zach told me he did not know what would happen nor what to expect but "it wasn't a problem. It wasn't something I was worried about. I just knew that this seemed right to sit down and let things take their course. See what happens. And deal with it as it happens" (Z14.24). One of the students raised his hand. "I wasn't expecting hands up, but as soon as I saw the first hand up, I realized ah, I clicked in real quick, he's going to ask me to continue" (Z14.24). He asked the student if this was so. When the student responded "yes," Zach waited for the same response from the rest of the class. He was surprised at how quickly most of the students followed suit and raised their hands too. "All of a sudden all these hands started going up. Because they saw that I was not overly pleased and I was stopping, and nothing was happening. And people hate that. They don't like it when nothing happens" (Z14.24). Soon only one student was not attending. The other students whispered to him, "Ask him to continue." When Zach had

everyone's attention, he continued with the lesson. He described this incident as only taking a minute or two and so he hadn't lost much time.

Zach imagined doing nothing worked because students do not like it when nothing is happening. He also told me that in this particular case, "I was controlling myself" (Z14.25) rather than attempting to control the students. "And then they were suddenly forced into a position where, what can I do to remedy this because life has stopped until I do something about this, and 'I' being the student. Not me, what's he going to do, because he's not doing anything" (Z14.25). Zach began to see he was not the only one responsible for making things happen in the classroom. "They wanted things to start happening. So, somehow, I was controlling the situation yet I wasn't controlling their response" (Z14.24).

It seemed to me like he was struggling during this time with two levels of "making it happen." One level was focused on himself and his own competence to make it happen. The other level was directed toward his students and having them make it happen for themselves.

Zach told me it was his responsibility to make the students learn, but how they actually worked on the assignments he designed was up to them. "Do as you like, but keep this stuff in mind. Let's see what you can do, right. And I like that because it's open, it makes them think. They're working together, they're actually accountable to each other" (Z13.10). This approach caused many tensions as Zach struggled with having students complete the work required while at the same time giving them the freedom to do it in their own way. Zach found that most of the students worked well in this atmosphere. "Most of the kids are great. I just have my few agitators. Most of them are just going strong. They're into this. They're doing projects, they're having a good time, they're on their own time. I'm not regimenting anything, I'm just saying do it" (Z13.9).

Zach began to use the phrase "make it happen" in his classes as a signal for the students to begin work. "I said it a couple of times last week, but today, somehow, it just became ingrained. The kids were 'Make it happen?' And I said Yeah, make it happen, now. Finished. And I never said anything else" (Z13.5). He told me he expected the students to listen to him until he had given them full instructions. Once they understood what he wanted, how they proceeded to fulfil those instructions was up to them. Zach encouraged them to make it happen in their own way. "It doesn't matter to me how they work as long as they work. Whatever works for them, make it happen. That's my new favorite line. I'm very very strict now. I've somehow become a bit of an ogre. These are my expectations, I lay them out and I lay them out just crystal clear. They know exactly what I expect" (Z13.4).

By the third week of his practicum, Zach was beginning to focus on how individual students "made it happen" for themselves. At times this provided new dilemmas as he tried to allow individual students to "make it happen" in their own way while not infringing on other students' ways of making it happen. Zach described one student who "knows how to work really loud and mess everyone else up so nobody else can do it. Like he's all over the place. But when you look at what he's done, he's done something. So somehow a guy's got to find a way without stifling his work, to calm him down a wee bit" (Z13.13).

While Zach tried to keep all the students at the same level, he became more and more aware of the individual differences in students, particularly those he described as "really weak." One student in particular stood out for Zach. "That girl could care less before when I walked in that class and now, she doesn't know anything yet, she's still having a hell of a lot of trouble, but she's started putting the burners on and she's trying. She got a one on the first assignment I gave her out of ten, and then she did a second assignment, a *dictat*, and she got three and a half out of ten" (Z13.2).

Zach was pleased with her improvement and made a special effort to encourage her. "I said 'You're improving. Just keep plugging away, you're getting there,' and I just made that comment to her" (Z13.2). Zach knew she needed individual encouragement. On a French exam "she came and asked me a couple of questions and I gave her a few more hints than I should have, but that doesn't matter because if she starts to improve that's good you know. Because I can't judge her according to the way I judge the other students" (Z13.2). Zach knew she needed extra support and encouragement to help her "make it happen." She could not travel the path alone.

Zach looked forward to her success in the group projects. "I'm expecting big things from this project from her because she'll be working with other people so she'll have that extra help" (Z13.2/3). He knew while she could not keep up with the other students on individual assignments and exams, she would benefit from working in a group. He described how things began to happen for her when she worked with others. "I assigned some sheets for them to do, but I said I want you to work in twos or threes. She looked around, and she knows a couple of the girls on the other side of the room and she picked up her stuff and went over and she started working. Otherwise she sits there and just stares at the wall. She can't do these sheets by herself" (Z13.2/3).

As his practicum was coming to a close, Zach began to make sense of his role as a teacher in a different way. He began to see himself as one part of the classroom situation.

> I'm finding less of a need to predict what's going to happen. And it's not bothering me as much. Like right at the beginning I was frustrated. Some days I could rip my hair out when I left that school because I thought I had failed, I had done something wrong. And yes, I did do something wrong. But it wasn't just me. The situation was wrong. Something, the combination of what was happening caused that to be wrong. So I'm starting to realize that it's not all on me. I'm just a part of it. I have to control my part and I have to make my part work better, but it's not just me. I can do everything I want and if the other sides of it do not agree it's a futile effort. (Z14.26)

Zach began to see past what he had believed was his responsibility as a teacher to be in control of the classroom situation to the bigger social situation of which a classroom was one example. "This is a social situation with other human beings. We have to deal with it in that way" (Z14.19/20). Zach made connections between life in society and life in the classroom. "Because we are social beings, you need to have a rapport with everybody you come in contact with. And our jobs happen to be with students so we need a rapport with students. You can't be an isolated entity where you're not part of it. You're part of a situation. You're part of an environment, part of a community. You have to maintain that part" (Z14.10). While Zach began to understand "I'm here in a society, the society being a community in school and I'm a part of it and that's all I am" (Z14.26/27), he also felt it was important for students to understand that "they're a part. They're not the whole" (Z14.26/27). Zach told me that "you do have a lot of say and students have a lot of say" (Z14.16). However, Zach did not completely abandon his sense of being a controlling force "and it's just a balance and it's a very slight disbalance but that disbalance must be there and stay there in order to keep moving forward, in order to keep society humming smoothly along" (Z14.16).

Zach now gave a different interpretation of what it meant to be in control in the classroom as he told the story of the Bubble Breaking in a new way.

> I was peeved with the kids, put it that way. They were doing their own thing, totally their own thing and it was not conducive to a social situation. They were not cooperating with each other. We were not getting anywhere, right. So suddenly, I lapsed to the power situation again and basically said "This is what's going to happen." And I have to fight that, but in some cases it is necessary. You have to learn to control it, you have to learn to manipulate that need, that desire to be in control because that's human nature, to be in power. But as a teacher you have to learn to fight human nature and control human nature, your own human nature, not the students, your own. (Z14.11)

An experience during the professional development day Zach attended during his practicum had a powerful effect on the way he began to see himself and his students. Zach

told me that "everybody is a part of a whole. And that goes back to the Teachers' Institute when he made it rain in the gym. Everybody was a part of that to make it happen" (Z14.27). Zach then told me the following story.

> He made it rain in the gym. It was the speaker, the first speaker, the main speaker they had that was in the gym in the morning. At 9:00 we went in. Seven hundred teachers sitting in a gym and one guy talks to you. And he said we're all a part, we're all an important part, real small, and if one of us disappears, it probably wouldn't make that much of a difference. But we're all a part. We all have our role to play. Everybody plays a really little part in the whole. But it's important. And then he said you know, each little part here, if we all work together, we can make it rain in the building. And he made it rain. And it was unbelievable. And I want to do that again sometime. Next time I get a whole room, like not a room, an auditorium full of people, I want to make it rain.
>
> It was great. There's four different things you have to learn how to do. And you have to do them in order. And each person does them, his own little part, first of all like this (rub hands together). Everybody has to do that. OK. So that's the first step. And then he teaches you the second step and that's basically, snapping your fingers a little bit like this. And the third part, patting your thighs. And the fourth part stamping your feet. Those are the four parts you have to know, OK. It's all real simple stuff. Now, we've got a whole room full of people. What I'm going to do is you're going to watch my hands. I'm going to go around, and as I go by you, you start doing the first step. And when I go by you the second time, you start doing the second step. Once we get all the way through all the steps, then I'll go by you again, and go back to the step before until we get to the point where there's no steps again and keep going like that. So then he started. He started, he said "Let's go. Watch me now." As he went by you start the first step which is basically like this (rubbing hands together). Hey, I heard something. Something is happening in here. And then all of a sudden the rain started to drop (snap fingers), the second step, and then it got harder (slap thighs). Everybody was going like this. It was just hitting the roof. And all of a sudden the feet start stamping, and a major thunder storm came down. And then he went back, and it went to just rain again, and all of a sudden, there was just a slight trickling (finger snapping) and then there was just a little bit of a wind (hands rubbing) and then all of a sudden there was nothing. Unbelievable. Seven hundred people did that. And you'd have, and they were all an important part. It was wild. And it was better than a rain storm. It was like a stereo everywhere. You heard this, you were part of it. And you were surprised you weren't wet. Well, you wouldn't be wet, cause it was more like you had a tin roof on you or something. You were out in some shelter and the wind was blowing and there was just a little tin roof on top of you or something. That's what you felt like. You were out in the wild. And then all of a sudden it started to rain and it was unbelievable. And that's something I'll never forget. Because, yeah, we're all a part. And each part is necessary in order to make the full effect. Each part is small. Like if you take one or two out it doesn't matter. But each part is important. Because you need ten parts to make a bigger part. And it was a really good analogy. And it was a way to show people not just to tell them. But to show people how important every little part is.

> I thought it was great. I want to do that with students one of these days. I'll be in the gym and say "Let's make it rain." It'll be great because if even 10% of those students have the same feeling I had at that second, it'll be worthwhile. And they'll know how little they are yet how big they are. So two total contradictions happening at the same time. You're such a little miniscule part, yet without you it's nothing. Once you start to realize that, you start to look at everything differently. It was great. And that's my little story for the evening. (Z14.27-29)

Interlude (January, 1992)

Zach began the winter term back at the university. During this five week period, his Social Studies Curriculum Methods course provided the opportunity to focus on getting ready to teach in the coming eight week practicum. He found that "the things we are covering are pertinent and practical" (January 13,1991).

Zach's university assignments included keeping a journal of his reflections as well as recording teaching ideas that he picked up. "I'm trying to write all these fancy new ideas that I'm supposedly getting. Some days I don't feel like I got a lot of new ones" (Z15.6). Zach hoped his journal would "come in handy once I'm teaching" (Z15.6). He also began to notice that once he started writing, "it's really surprising me what I do write because I go off on a different tangent. Where did that come from?" (Z15.6).

Zach began recording suggested classroom activities he thought he could use. He now focused careful attention on a variety of teaching strategies. Zach commented on how Al, his instructor, used different techniques to involve his students. In one situation "he asked those students who were presenting to come and write down the points themselves. He delegated the work to others. They are just as capable as he is in many areas so they should be called upon to contribute their skills. This is something I learned in the army: delegate responsibility" (January 15, 1992).

Zach was also impressed with the way Al became part of the class when he "participated in all the student run activities today. Having the teacher do something the students design is a way to give those students a feeling of credibility. They begin to realize that they too have something to offer the academic world they are in" (January 14, 1992).

Zach was always looking for something new to try. "My idea of teaching is always being something different so the kids are always 'Hey, what's going to happen today?' That's what I think a good teacher is" (Z16.27). He had told me earlier how he liked to use analogies because he believed they were a tool he could use to help students connect new learning with something they already understood or had experienced. He was

now becoming concerned with his overuse of analogies. "There's nothing wrong with analogies. But I'm doing it too much. So it's becoming old" (Z16.27).

Zach learned where his final practicum placement was to be during his first week back at university and made arrangements at that time to "attend her classes on Friday. This way I'll get a feel for the environment" (January 13, 1992). He connected his desire to see his placement situation ahead of time with his own learning style. "I like to see things. I don't need to be overly prepared, but I don't like to walk in blind either. I need to have a rough idea, a rough picture of where I'm going" (Z16.7).

When Zach described his school visit to me, he had so much to tell. His story was filled with comparisons from his last practicum experience as well as connections to his university assignments. He focused on specific things he wanted to know. He also had a clearer vision, both of what he was looking for as well as seeing more things beyond the surface. "It's all the same picture, but I'm seeing different things. It's like, another analogy that just popped into my head, it's like watching a black and white TV and then suddenly seeing color. You see a lot more" (Z15.3).

Knowing his practicum placement three weeks ahead of time allowed Zach to ease his way in. He visited the school at least six times during his five week university course and all his efforts seemed focused on getting ready to begin the practicum. During his first classroom visit, he "sat in on one of her classes. She gave me a timetable and a school handbook as well as some of the textbooks that the classes are using" (January 17,1992).

He was now able to read the timetable he was given in a more informed way. "But now it's less confusing. Back then I didn't realize it could be confusing" (Z15.4). Rather than finding it overwhelming as he had in his previous practicum, Zach's narrative knowledge enabled him to imagine how this schedule would influence his teaching. "I was suddenly looking at 'How often do I get these kids? How much time am I going to have with them?'" (Z15.4/5). It was useful in helping him begin to read the situation he would be getting into. Zach seemed more comfortable with the six day cycle. "because I've been in that exact six day schedule already at a different school" (Z15.4). He was now able to think about the consequences of this cycle for his teaching. He described how he thought it would affect the teaching of Social Studies and Health. "I noticed in the Health class, I'm only going to see them twice in a six day period for Health. That's not a lot of time. I mean how do you cover all this material with only two days, two periods every six days? 45 minute periods, you know. Whereas in Social Studies, I'll see them, I believe it's five out of the six days. I can do something with that" (Z15.4/5).

Zach focused on both the physical arrangement and social atmosphere of the classroom. This time, things would be different. "Anne's room has the desks set up in

the conventional style: rows. I have grown accustomed to a horseshoe shape for the desks. I feel this fosters discussion because kids face each other. We'll see how different this setting will be compared to my past experiences. The attitude of the class I sat in on does appear to be relaxed and I like that" (January 17,1992). Zach was pleased to have the opportunity to re-experience the situation of the rows arrangement now that he had some teaching experience behind him. As well as the two practicum experiences that took place during our research, Zach had participated in a Phase I practicum consisting of ten half-days spent in elementary and secondary school classrooms. He had also taken advantage of volunteer teaching programs set up by the Education Students' Association. "I was in a traditional style classroom for Phase I and my volunteer teaching but at that point, I still didn't know what the game was about, speaking of the game again. I still don't know what it's about, but I have a lot clearer idea than I did before. And even though I did try traditional, I didn't have any experience back then so I couldn't make an informed decision. Now, hopefully, I can make a little bit more informed decision" (Z15.3).

For his unit plan assignment, Zach was developing something "for both my practicum and my [university] assignment" (January 21,1992). Because he would actually implement this "unit on cultural transition using Japan as a background" (January 21, 1992) during his practicum, he needed to find out contextual information from his cooperating teacher. "Anne will be the best person to ask. I have to find out what these students do as a routine before I can make up a unit plan. Once I find that out I can begin to plan. After all, you can't teach something well until you know your audience" (January 21, 1992). Zach now knew teaching was an interaction between himself and his students. Understanding the context had become crucial to his planning.

As Zach thought about beginning his final practicum, his sense of being a guest in someone else's classroom placed restrictions on what he felt he would be able to do. He would need to fit into the narrative flow already established by Anne and her students.

> It is her classroom. I'm simply stepping in for a short time and I can't tear apart what she's set up because it is her classroom and it's her rules, it's her little world and I'm going to come into her world. I'm not setting up my own world. It's not like if you were starting your first job and you had your own classroom suddenly. Then you could set up your own world because it's yours. But since we're not there til the end, it's not fair for us to disrupt their entire setup because they have to take over when we leave, and when we leave for call backs and all that so, they're comfortable with the way they do things and that's the way we have to leave it. (Z15.1)

Zach imagined the practicum as a situation where he could learn from someone who had more experience than himself. "I don't have enough experience to know what's

the best way so I'm trusting on somebody else's experience, the way they set it up and I'll try that out" (Z15.2). He saw it as an opportunity to try different things that would give him a broader experiential base. "Then I will make my decision based on something that I've tried, not something that I think, because I mean theory is great, but it comes to a point where you have to try things" (Z15.2). However, Zach realized while he had to "fit into the situation" (Z16.21), his presence in the classroom would change the situation "because it's a situation that maybe you haven't totally created but you've had a part in it" (Z16.21).

Zach also began to articulate a clearer sense of his place as a teacher. "You're not responsible for them, you're responsible to them" (Z16.17). He saw his responsibility as one of helping students learn how to learn. This focus led him to value the skills objectives in the Program of Studies. "I like the skills objectives in every curriculum I've read so far because that's what's important to me. Content is simply the material I use to make what I want happen" (Z15.14).

While Zach believed students would forget a lot of what they learned, they would continue to remember how to find information. "Even if I had it before and I forget it, I'll know where to find it. And that's the key. So that's what I want to teach" (Z15.15). Thus, Zach placed a high value on teaching skills "because that's what they're going to take through their lives" (Z15.16). Zach not only wanted to focus on how to acquire information, but also

> How to work in groups, work with each other. Respect each other, tolerance. These are the things I want to teach. I mean, they'll remember something about Japan from what I teach them now. They'll probably, in 10 years, be able to remember Yes, Japan is on that end of the world and they'll remember a few little things. That's not the content that I'm after as much as the group skills, like what they learn to do, how they learn to look for things, how they learn to interact. (Z15.14/15)

During this time Zach also talked about his awareness of moving more definitely into the adult phase of his life. "You're not looking and it creeps up on you and you don't even realize it's happening and all of a sudden it's happened" (Z16.3). When I asked how he felt about this transition, he said he felt a definite separation from adolescence and knew he had joined the other side. "I can see myself, once I'm teaching full time and then there will be a definite rift between myself and the students because of a generation gap" (Z16.1/2). When I asked if, by the "other side" (Z16.1/2), he meant teachers, he explained, "It's not so much with teachers. You can no longer be frivolous as in saying to heck with it. You have responsibility and you've accepted that and that comes first, right.

And youth, you don't think about that" (Z16.2/3). However, his involvement in a serious car accident a few years ago made him realize how tentative tomorrow really is. Zach qualified this sense of responsibility in the following way. "I never forget the fact that if I'm not living today, I don't have to worry about tomorrow because tomorrow may never come. And I think that's the life of a student" (Z16.5).

In some ways Zach could connect his own school experience with that of his future students. He remembered "the good times. Being bad. I can associate with that because that's what I was. I can understand because I was there for the fun time too" (Z16.5). However, in many ways Zach was very leery to rely on his memories of his past school experience to help him understand his future students. He told me that even though he could remember his own school experiences of junior high and high school, the experiences of his students could never be the same as his and he could never really know what the experience was like for them. "Oh I can remember that world, but what I remember, is not their world. I remember my world. And you have to keep that in mind" (Z16.4).

Zach was aware of a generation gap and did not want to impose his stories of his experience at their age on his students. "You have to keep an open mind. You have to realize that they are someplace else. They're not where I am right now" (Z16.6). Zach described how a person's past was safer than an unknown future. "You always see the good, you forget the bad. Part of the reason for that would be because you're afraid, or anxious toward something you don't know. That something that's gone past, it's sort of a haven, a safe haven" (Z16.28).

Zach was not only moving to a new practicum phase, but also to the close of his teacher education program. He described how the goal of getting his degree was almost reached and a new goal was starting to form on the horizon. "Because this is coming to a close now, I can see the end, the next goal is formulating and that's certification which is two years of teaching, but after that, I haven't got the foggiest" (Z16.18). Zach believed in being prepared and having some idea of what he was getting into, "but I can't map out my entire life because I don't know how long it's going to be. That's a mistake. It's a mistake both to live totally frivolously without any idea of what you're doing, but it's also a mistake to figure out too much" (Z16.18).

As Zach imagined starting his practicum, he believed it would be his place to carry out the agenda that had been set for him by others. "I'm not setting the agenda here. So here I follow the route of someone else's footsteps or whatever they decided to be footsteps, right" (Z16.10). Part of this agenda was the curriculum. "The curriculum that is set out, it's my basic foundation. I need to know what to teach. As well, you're legally

obligated to do that. One of the rules again, right" (Z15.11/12). Zach felt that having the curriculum set out by others would make his job easier. If he did not have to spend time deciding what to teach, he would have more time and energy to spend focusing on how to teach it. "That's one thing less that I have to do. I don't have to decide what to teach. Now I know what to teach, I have to decide how I'm going to teach it" (Z15.11/12).

Zach continued to place himself "heading in a direction, you're in the middle of that path" (Z16.23). He was becoming more accepting of his "position" "because you know where you are" (Z16.23). He began to realize the only place he could be was the place where he was at that moment. "This is right because it's where I am. I don't really want to be anywhere else" (Z16.23).

Zach also saw himself placed in a matrix of choices that would affect the directions he chose. "You make choices which would make certain choices for you" (Z16.20/21). Some of these choices were made by himself which in turn limited future choices. "Because your background, everything, is making choices for you, you know. Helping you make that path. Helping you or hindering you from what you want to do. But it is still a direction" (Z16.20/21). In other ways, Zach's own choices were set within an interactive social context which placed his choices in relationship with others. In this sense, his choices were shaped by everyone and everything.

> Everybody does. Everything does. Your environment chooses the direction. Your past chooses your direction. The people around you choose the direction. The people above you, as in administration, choose a direction. Everybody, absolutely everybody has input. Your students, when you're teaching, your students choose a direction. Everybody has a little part in making those choices. In making your own choices which set choices for you. You have leeway, but the choices have been set. The outside lines are there. (Z16.21)

Zach imagined this mutual choosing would be part of his future practicum as he began to imagine himself placed in a more interactive relationship with his students. "You make your choices. You're automatically going to make some choices for them. They still have leeway. But everything you do is going to set a certain boundary for them whereas what they're doing is setting boundaries for you as well" (Z16.21).

Finale (February to April, 1992)

Zach also started his eight week practicum with a sense of uncertainty. After both practicums were over, he told me, "I think I went in more not knowing what the heck I had

to do. And being scared of that uncertainty" (Z22.15). However, Zach described his first full day at the school "with one word: comfortable" (February 10, 1992). Part of this feeling came from the rapport Zach felt extended to him "from the people in this new environment; they welcomed me warmly into their midst, students and teachers alike" (February 10, 1992); part came from Zach's narrative knowledge of teaching. "Some of the credit must be given to my past experience in schools. This situation, while different, is no longer foreign to me. I was not overwhelmed by new information like when I began my adventure in teaching" (February 10, 1992).

Zach began this practicum with some planning ideas already in mind. He had been out to the school several times and had prepared a resource manual on Japan. Other initial planning was based on his previous practicum experience. He had found lesson plans and day plans to be useful and so he "made up some forms on the computer last night: a form for a lesson plan and a form for a day planner. They are tailored to meet my needs and I think they'll help to keep me more organized" (February 11, 1992).

Zach had changed his mind from his previous practicum and decided to go over certain expectations with his students that he hoped would help his plans run more smoothly. Zach would expect assignments to be handed in on time. If not, "the school late policy applies" (Z17.4). Zach knew from his previous practicum experience it could be difficult to keep track of individual student's assignments. This time, he wanted all assignments clearly identified with "their first and last names along with their class number because I have so many that I will not be able to tell them apart" (Z17.4). Zach also explicitly stated his expectation that "when I'm addressing the class or when any one of you is addressing the class I expect everyone else to listen" (Z17.4). In order to keep discussions moving smoothly, Zach would also expect students "to raise your hand and wait to be recognized before saying anything" (Z17.4).

Zach put a lot of time and effort into his planning. "So far this seems to be the most difficult part of my practicum" (February 13, 1992). It seemed like the time he spent planning helped him imagine how he hoped situations would develop in his classes. "I spend a lot of time on them because it gives me a sense of comfort when I'm up there teaching to know that I'm well prepared" (February 13, 1992).

Anne was helpful to Zach in his planning. As he explained his lessons to her, they became clearer in his own mind. "She made me go through it and explain it and by explaining it to her, I explained it to myself. And suddenly I was planned and ready" (Z21.4). Anne pointed to areas Zach may not have thought out by the questions she asked. "Somehow, she manages to pick out things that I might have overlooked but

suddenly, by asking that question, I quickly plan it and suddenly it's there and it's really strange" (Z21.4).

Zach had also become aware, perhaps during his previous practicum, that the paradigmatic curriculum-as-planned and the narrative curriculum-as-lived were two different things. "There's always going to be something that comes out of the ordinary. But if you plan it, the main framework, you're prepared and if you're prepared, you won't have problems" (Z21.4). Zach knew from previous experience that being well planned was not the only thing necessary for a lesson to move along smoothly. "The presence of familiar teachers" (February 11, 1992) in the room also had an effect on the students' response. He knew "the students will push a little harder when I am alone with them" (February 11, 1992). Zach knew this was a possible way for the narrative to be played out by students. "I don't know if this is true or not but if I expect it, maybe it won't catch me by surprise" (February 11, 1992).

Zach also knew it would be necessary to adjust his written plans to the narrative contingencies of the classroom context. "You have to be aware and realize that nothing is ever the same. You have to be open to the change if it needs to be there. I adjust my lesson plans as I go. I don't adjust them on the paper" (Z19.5).

Shortly after Zach began his practicum, his father was injured in a construction accident. Suddenly, Zach needed to take over many of his father's responsibilities at home as well as his own teaching and university responsibilities. Zach described how, "when I get to school I leave the outside troubles behind" (February 20, 1992). However, his preparation time was limited. "Much of my outside time is now occupied with family affairs and I don't have the time I would like to devote to planning. It has not hampered my performance in school but I am always rushed to get things ready" (February 20, 1992).

Zach found that at school he was able to focus his full attention on his students. Two days after his father's accident, he wrote in his journal describing the morning at school after he had received a phone call about the accident.

> The students came in and I began my lesson. Time flew by and the lunch hour bell rang. From the time the students walked in until they left, I forgot what had happened to my father. I sat there for a minute after to collect my thoughts and then suddenly realized, teaching was what I was meant to do. I was at peace in front of the classroom; I forgot my troubles; that time belongs to my students and for those short stretches, nothing else matters. (February 20, 1992)

Zach soon found he did not have enough time for everything. "It has been another difficult week. My time is forever running short" (March 2, 1992). Zach found "my workload at home is competing for that time. It's a balancing act between two sides: school and home" (March 2, 1992). While Zach described this conflict as "manageable" (March 2, 1992), he could not find the time "to work on my callback assignments" (March 2, 1992).

When Zach had to '"make cuts" (Z19.15), he made his choices in the following way. Zach's university assignments had to "go by the wayside until I have time and I really hope I survive and I hope I get something put together" (19.16). He wrote, "This worries me but the only place I can afford to cut is things that I do for myself, like my course work" (March 2, 1992). His university assignments would "affect my future and nobody else's" (Z19.16) while teaching and home were more important "because you're dealing with other people's lives" (Z19.16).

Zach's journal became a way of letting himself know he was making progress. Finding time to write in his journal let him know he was managing other areas better. While discussing his journal with me he said, "Today I actually found time [to write] because I think I'm ahead of the game. I'm starting to move ahead. Like I'm no longer just keeping up. I'm starting to get ahead and that's going to make a difference and hopefully I'll be able to let that flow into other things" (Z19.17).

As he gained more teaching experience Zach described himself as "becoming better able to think on my feet" (Z19.5). The situations Zach had already lived through provided ideas of what might work in new situations. "I've got this collection back here locked in my head of experience" (Z19.5). Zach was beginning to recognize similarities in new situations that reminded him of things that had worked in previous situations. "I can see, because I've been there before now, it's not working, I have to change something, but I already have a bunch of ways to change it and that takes time and experience" (Z19.5).

Zach's ability to plan expanded in other ways. During his four week practicum "I did individual lessons. I took over, but on an individual basis according to her unit" (Z22.15/16). During the present practicum, Zach "suddenly had to not only do those individual lessons. I had to make up a unit. So it was like Graduation. Everything moved up. Now I've done that, the next logical step is to do the whole year" (Z22.15/16). Zach began to plan for more than isolated 45 minute periods when he found the concepts he was trying to teach did not fit neatly into 45 minute blocks. Zach shifted his attention from planning the time to planning how he wanted to teach a concept and then figuring out how long this would take. "When I write, I plan a concept. Like this survey that I did now is

working out to be two and a half periods. That's one lesson. One idea. That's how I write it up" (Z19.17).

Zach was able to begin planning in this way as he began to have a sense of the lived time required to carry out his written plans. Zach was already familiar with teaching the French curriculum. "If you'd asked me to do a French lesson, I'll tell you exactly how much I can cover because I've got experience in that" (Z19.10). Since teaching Health and Social Studies were new experiences for Zach "that's what I was lost on, the idea of what I could cover because it was a whole new subject area" (Z19.10). As Zach gained narrative experience he told me, "Finally I know a little bit and each subject area, the students are going to take it differently as to how much time you're going to devote to discussion and how long you let the discussion go, all these things you slowly start to get an idea for once you've done it a few times. It just gets easier that way" (Z19.10).

Since each class moved at a different rate in the curriculum-as-lived, Zach continually adjusted his planning to account for this while at the same time trying to keep the different classes at roughly the same place in his curriculum-as-planned. He described being "a lot further ahead" (Z18.13) with one class and so "somehow I'm going to slow them down a little bit when I see them on Thursday" (Z18.13).

It became important for Zach to get to know his students as individuals. At the beginning of the practicum he made "an effort to meet as many students as I can" (February 10,1992). He also spent most of his lunch hours with the students. "There's nothing happening in the staffroom. Where it's happening is out in the hall and in my room, my homeroom is there for lunch. That's where the action is" (Z17.4). Zach also made a point of attending the parent-teacher conferences because "I find them another way of getting to know my students" (February 20, 1992). He found these conferences gave him "little insights to students' backgrounds. The more we know, the better we can relate to the individual students" (February 21, 1992).

While it was important for him to acknowledge individual differences, Zach did not want to single individuals out from the group. For example, when Zach was "dictating answers for the summary" (Z19.4) he suddenly remembered one of his students was legally deaf. Since he "was in the back of the room and she sits in the front" (Z19.4), Zach moved closer to her "without even changing my pace" (Z19.4) and "I stood in front of her and I repeated it again without acknowledging that ok you have a problem or anything. Just like, ok, well this is the situation, I didn't say anything. Nothing needed to be said, and then away she went. She got it all" (Z19.4). Zach always tried to draw students into the group rather than single them out. With a new student from Hong Kong language was a problem. However, Zach could not determine ahead of time "how I'm going to deal with

that" (Z19.4). Zach told me, "I'll have to see how he handles it because his progress [in learning English] is daily, hourly even so I don't know what he's doing now compared to last week" (Z19.4). Zach would "have to wait and see how he takes it and if he's going well, I won't stop my flow because I want him to become part of us instead of me going to him. I'll do it a different way somehow if he still needs the help, but I'll decide that on the spot" (Z19.4).

While Zach wanted to draw all the students into the group, he began to realize this was not possible. "What's really sad is my dream is dying in the fact that I figure all students should be able to learn it because I can do it, and I if I can do it, I should be able to make them to do it and I can't and I'm realizing I can't" (Z19.3). Zach had to make choices between the group and individual students "because you've got so many, you have to save as many as you can. You can't let the mass go for the one. You have to let the one go for the mass" (Z19.4).

Zach struggled with continuing to try new teaching techniques while at the same time wanting to be confident his lessons would go successfully. He revisited Pat, his cooperating teacher from first term. His memories of this practicum seemed to provide a safe haven while he struggled with the uncertainties of the unknown in his new placement.

> I spent a few minutes chatting with her and I left that school feeling more at ease. I guess I needed a moral boost and I found this by going back to the site of a successful previous experience. Things are tough right now and somehow I feel like everything is closing in on me. I am worried about the callback assignments because of the time factor. I don't know when I'm going to do them. As well, planning my lessons is giving me some degree of trouble. I am forever questioning the choices I make of content and presentation techniques. I hope this questioning decreases a little because I don't like being uncertain. (February 21, 1992)

Zach began to believe he could teach and this allowed him to focus on different ways to accomplish his job. "I'm becoming less anxious about my skills. I'm not questioning can you do this? I can do this. I just have to decide how I'm going to do this, that's all I have to do. The questions change" (Z19.9). Zach began to accept that the lived classroom situation could not go exactly as planned and allowed himself to relax. He told me "not everything goes perfect in a classroom. But I think I'm coming to that acceptance and because I'm starting to accept it, I'm starting to worry less about being absolutely perfect" (Z19.9). While Zach needed to have his plans on paper, he had also come to realize that was not the only way to teach a particular lesson. He continued to assess his lessons and look for better or different ways of accomplishing his goals. "There's no accepting. There's always a way to do it differently and better and you just have to always

look back at what you've done and see how you could improve it" (Z22,16). Zach was beginning to know his narrative of teaching would always be changing and he would need to adapt his written plan to fit the situation. "You do the same lesson a couple of times a day and it changes, because you're thinking. You're not doing it the same because that's the way you did it on paper" (Z22,16).

In one class in particular, management became a priority. "Somehow the chemistry in that class makes management something that must be at the top of your list of priorities" (March 2, 1992). Zach tried different ways of handling this class, but did not seem to find a satisfactory resolution.

> They are my challenge during this experience. I ended up giving them a 15 minute detention (the whole class) at lunch hour. Unfortunately the entire class is punished when I use this method. I've been trying different things to get a better handle on them and I don't think I'll use this method again. It is not fair to punish the whole class when it is only half the class that is causing problems. (April 6, 1992)

Zach felt management needed to be an individual thing where students could be in a situation that would work for them. He valued what individual students had to offer to his classes and expected others to do the same. He tried to create situations that would provide students the opportunity to be on task. How they actually chose to deal with the situation was up to them.

The tension between planned time and lived time was a continual frustration for Zach. "Now I've got the momentum I can't slow down because I've actually got a fairly tight schedule to get through this all" (Z18.2). Not only was he on a "tight schedule," but this schedule had two major interruptions which caused further concern. The first interruption to the rapport and continuity Zach had established was his university callback session. He would miss a week of classroom teaching and wanted a plan to ensure that Anne would have time to do her art project but not put him behind schedule. "I will be done chapter four this week so the next week she will have them and she can run into chapter five with that project that she always does. If I time everything just right it'll work out so that she can do her project and chapter five will be taken care of and I'll come back, she may start on chapter six" (Z19.6).

Zach also had assignments due during the callback session. While these assignments were on Zach's mind throughout the first four weeks of his practicum, he ended up actually preparing them during callback week. "The biggest stress factor for the week was the preparation of the Unit Plan. While I was thinking about it during my

Practicum, there was never time to do it. All of it had to be done this week" (March 12, 1992).

Most of the information included in his unit plan Zach had used or planned to use in his own teaching. However, while he knew the plan worked for him, "my biggest problem was deciding on a format I was comfortable with" (March 12, 1992). The unit plan that was so useful to him during his teaching became a burden as a university assignment that needed to be handed in for credit. Zach had been given examples of unit plans in his Teaching Methods course, "but none of them really fit what I wanted to do" (March 12, 1992). Talking with another student was helpful. "Then I had a conversation with Dave and he gave me his format. It seemed workable and I really liked a lot of his ideas. In the end, I did restructure and make changes to his ideas but it was his ideas that got me started" (March 12, 1992).

Once Zach completed his unit plan, he began to think about his final assignment which was a synthesis paper. However, he told me, "I'm not quite sure where I am going with that yet; it will take some more thought" (April 6, 1992). Zach seemed to need to wait until his practicum was over before he could begin to synthesize the process. He needed all the parts before he could make sense of the whole.

Zach completed all his university assignments and ended the callback week focused toward his school responsibilities. He knew there "should have been a break from my in-school assignment but it did not happen. I did not want it to happen" (March 12, 1992). Zach valued the "smooth flow" (March 12, 1992) he had established with the students. "I didn't want to chance losing it. I wanted to stay in touch" (March 12, 1992). At this time, being both a student and a teacher left Zach "little time for anything else" (March 12, 1992).

When Zach returned to school after his university callback session, he told me, "I'm just scrambling" (Z21.11). He had talked to Anne on the weekend. "She called me Saturday morning. She wanted to talk to me to give me a rough idea where she was and how far she got" (Z20.4). In Health "it worked out perfect. She had enough time to finish off everything I had done. (Z20.4). In Social Studies "she didn't get as far as I originally thought she would and I'm a lesson behind where I wanted to be" (Z20.4/5). While Zach was able to adjust quickly, he was concerned about being behind where he wanted to be in an already tight schedule. Not only was his schedule tight, but his responsibilities expanded to include things other than actual lesson plans.

> There's so many things. Weird as in all these new things happening, yet somehow I'm adjusting to it. And they were there before, but I never saw

> them before because I wasn't doing them. Anne was still taking care of that stuff. (Z21.11/12)

Zach's planning moved outside the actual classroom as he tried to make arrangements for his students to visit the Japanese doll display in the school library. "Scheduling library periods has now been included into my focus of teaching" (March 20, 1992). Zach had expected Anne "to have a lesson incorporating it last week but [she] told me Tuesday that there had been no time" (March 20, 1992). When Zach tried to "schedule last minute periods" (March 20, 1992) he found "library time is at a premium in our school" (March 20, 1992). Zach told me that "through some switching, I managed to book the necessary time. I was lucky" (March 20, 1992).

Zach no longer left these bookings up to Anne. "From now on, I have to plan all my library periods a week or two in advance, so as to avoid these problems. The same has to be done when booking AV equipment" (March 20, 1992). He decided to book the audiovisual equipment he would need for the rest of his practicum. When he was told by the librarian that the booking sheets for the next two weeks were not yet ready, he took blank sheets and made new ones. He filled in the dates for the next two weeks and signed his name by the periods in which he wanted the equipment. This was another step in taking over as a teacher.

Zach tried several different teaching techniques and activities during this practicum. Each time he tried something new, he worried about how it would turn out. "My little insecurities. That's how I explained it to Anne. I'm overcoming these insecurities. I give up one insecurity, but I take on another one right away because I'm not stopping. I don't stop. When I get used to something, I move on to the next thing that's brand new and so I'm just giving up one insecurity for another one" (Z21.2). However, Zach also began to realize that trying new things was contributing to his growth and confidence as a teacher. "The more I give up, the more I've got behind me in my repertoire and so suddenly, the new ideas aren't totally new anymore because they're little parts of other things so I'm becoming more comfortable" (Z21.2). Zach imagined that as a teacher "the new challenge will be they give you something new" (Z22.16). Even if he had taught "absolutely everything there is to teach it will still always change because the people you teach are always different" (Z22.16)

When I asked if there were any things he had tried that he would not try again, Zach said, "No. There may be some I would revise but so far everything I've tried I would use again because the only reason I tried them was because I saw some merit in them and so far I've been fortunate enough that my choices have been good" (Z22.19).

When I asked if he was becoming more flexible in his planning, Zach explained in the following way. "That plan must be there. But, your implementation of that plan is flexible. You deal with it as things go but you need a solid plan there as a standby in case you need to fall back on something. You have to be able to go back to what you have written in the form of a lesson or whatever. This is where I am, now I can start again. You need that as a security builder. I'm comfortable when I have it written" (Z21.5).

Zach began having students work in pairs near the beginning of the practicum. Zach told me, "I really like that group thing. Working in pairs" (Z19.10/11). He planned to do more of it. "I think that's what I'm going to do for my writing assignment. I'm going to let them turn in a two name paper" (Z19.10/11). When I asked why he liked the students working in groups, he replied, "Because it's Social Studies. And just the word by itself, social, means you have to do it with more than one person. It's not a lone venture to find your way through. You do things together. Social means together" (Z19.10/11). Zach's narrative knowing and the curriculum assignments he authored were becoming integral.

> The interaction was important and it's just one more thing that goes to show that working together and making things happen, you can't do it all by yourself and it just built on my old bias that group work is good. You must work together and somehow you have to compromise together to make it work. I learned that a long time ago. (Z21.17)

As Zach began to see himself as an integral part of the classroom situation, he began to redefine the part he needed to play as the teacher. "You have to fit in, yes. But fitting in and manipulating are so close that after a little while it's hard to find that line and you have to do both" (Z19.14). Rather than needing to control students, he needed to "manipulate the situation" (Z19.14). Zach had learned to work with his students and gave them space to make their own narrative connections within the prescribed curriculum. He saw his role as leader differently. "I am ultimately responsible for what happens and if I am responsible, I have to maintain some sense of I am leading this even though they're leading it, or they think they're leading it, I'm still leading it or how do you say, facilitating it in the right direction. I'm still in control and I have to maintain that control" (Z21.13).

Zach now described teaching as "one job" (Z21.1/2). What had been separate isolated tasks were now part of the whole. "Like I have to go and make library bookings and that so I can go to the library. But that's all part of the one job. Before it used to be a separate task. It's not a separate task anymore. It's just part of the daily routine and things are coming together" (Z21.1/2). Zach was able to integrate the separate tasks as he became more familiar with the various tasks and roles he was required to fulfil. "And it's not a

burden anymore. It used to be a burden. Well, at first something new is a burden and still something new is a burden, but everything that's not new anymore has become part of the regular" (Z21.1/2).

Zach also began to understand the term "reflective teacher" as someone who must stay open to change. "What's happening is always different. So it's never the same. That goes into that learning I was talking about. You can't stop. It makes sense now. You hear all these things before. Reflective teacher. What kind of mumbo jumbo is that? I didn't understand it. Now I understand what it means" (Z22.16).

However, while Zach saw the value in remaining open, he had earlier qualified this. "You can't constantly be open. It's impossible to constantly be open, because then you won't do anything" (Z16.25). Again, Zach would need to find his own balance as he stayed open to change, but needed to make decisions in order to make things happen. He explained how a new idea became internalized "because it makes sense" (Z22.18). Zach would select the things which fit with his narrative knowing and incorporate them into his teaching. Once he had accepted them, there was no need to question them further. He could then focus on other issues. He used the example of "turning things back right away" (Z22.18). He described how it became part of his narrative knowledge in the following way.

> Instant feedback. I've seen it done for me, heard about it being done, I've done it myself. I've thought about it. I like it. There's no question for me. I don't have to think is it right or wrong. It is right for me. It might not be right for somebody else, but for me it's right, so I don't think about it anymore. I just do it. Things like that have to become internalized. You cannot think about absolutely everything that you do. You have to do something so you have time to think about other things. Those are the choices you make. (Z22.18)

While Zach had initially found his practicum experience "overwhelming," he was pleased when "all these little things at school are becoming everyday occurrences for me" (Z21.2). Zach was also pleased that his teaching became less problematic as he became more accustomed to what to expect. "As soon as you know they might happen, it's no longer a problem because you're ready for it whenever it does happen" (Z21.2/3). Once Zach understood, the way he would deal with routines would become a habit. This would enable him to "move on. There are a lot of things that we're going to do that you just do that way and that's it. Once you understand how to do it you don't think about it any more. A couple of times of practice at it and you just do it. You don't worry about it. It becomes a habit. That's the way you deal with it" (Z22.17).

Zach described how, when something was new, he would think about what he was doing. "The first time or the second time you do it and maybe the third time, you may think about it a little bit" (Z22.17). However, once he understood the reasons for doing something, "it's a waste of your time to think about it because that's the way it is. You do it. You become institutionalized in that matter. But, you'll only do that with things you agree with. But once you've accepted it, and you have no problem with it, you don't think about it any more" (Z22 17).

Zach wanted to put his energy into thinking about the choices he would make in his teaching. He did not want to waste time thinking about things over which he believed he had no control.

> There's a line there somewhere and every person draws their own line. School's not going to change. I've accepted that is the best way. If somebody comes up with a new way, I'll look at it but I'm not going to worry about it because I like the way it is. And I'm not going to waste my energy thinking about that. I'll conserve it there so I can use it here. It's choices. The teacher makes choices. That's all he does. He or she makes choices. He's faced with the hundreds of choices that he has to make and he makes them. (Z22.18)

CHAPTER FIVE

SUSAN'S STORY

Initially I had planned on capturing both university and school practicum experiences during the third year of Susan's program. However, with the restructuring of the elementary education program, Susan's practicum experience was moved to the final year of her program. Thus we worked together for both of her third year university terms and the full term of practicum during the first term of her fourth year.

There are many ways to tell about Susan's experiences during the three terms we worked together. A version told of Susan by an observer could be of the model student graduating with distinction, receiving a scholarship, being an executive member of two student council groups, and having time for home, family, and friends. This version would tell of glowing practicum reports and her ability to think carefully and critically about educational issues. In fact, this version would be the canonical (Bruner, 1986) version of the perfect student, perfect woman -- the cover story many of us have learned to tell as the story for which to strive. However, the stories told and the stories we live are often two different versions. The stories Susan chose to tell me focused on her continual dissatisfaction with her program, her professors, and herself. These were stories of disillusionment, disconnection and dissention -- stories of frustration and confusion, of fear and anxiety. Brown (1991) and Gilligan (1991) have helped me begin to make sense of these two seemingly incommensurable stories -- the cover story I (and others) could see and tell about Susan, and the stories Susan told me about herself.

Brown (1991) tells us

> For girls, adolescence is a time of particular vulnerability; a point where a girl is encouraged to give over or to disregard or devalue what she feels and thinks -- what she knows about the world of relationships -- if she is to enter the dominant views of conventional womanhood. . . . She is encouraged to enter, to buy into, a story that she has not known to be true from her experiences in childhood. (P. 83)

Susan struggled to retell the authorized stories she heard told in her teacher education program in ways which connected with the stories she had constructed from her narrative knowing of teaching and learning. Susan experienced a continual struggle between what she called "going with the flow" (S10.25), or trying to live the culturally authorized story, and resisting the authorized story to explore the stories lived by individuals. Susan needed to think carefully about the authorized versions being presented

to her in her teacher education program. "First of all you figure out the flow, and you think about it, if it's good or bad for you. And when you think it's bad, and you go with it anyway, I think that's wrong. Like sometimes I do have to do it [and] I think that's where, in my head, the problems start happening because I start feeling down on myself because 'Why did I do that, or say that, or go with that?' knowing full well that I don't believe in that" (S10.26).

Susan felt it was important to think carefully about issues and raise questions in order to uncover the lived stories in their contextual complexity. By exploring underlying issues, Susan felt it would be possible to "see what's really going on" (S3.12) and begin to imagine ways to change present stories and construct better ones. She found little support for this view as others saw her as idealistic or negative. "I think there's a difference between being positive and being blind. And I find a lot of blind people at this university. I don't see what is so wrong with having high expectations" (S10.25). Susan often felt alone in trying to penetrate to issues she felt were covered up and ignored by the authorized stories. "No one wants to make waves. No one wants to be the rebel or the revolutionary person or whatever and I think if a lot more people were, it might be a better place . . . everywhere. If you're still in perspective and you're not radical, but you have thought carefully about the issue and what it means to you and what it means to everyone else around you, and decided is it worthwhile to fight about or is it worthwhile to let it slide and most people don't even think, don't even get that far. They just think let that slide right off the bat" (S10.27).

To attempt to "refuse the established story" (Brown, 1991, p. 72) often left Susan feeling lost and alone. Brown (1991) tells us

> A girl who chooses to authorize her life experiences by speaking openly about them resists the security of convention and moves into uncharted territory; she sets herself adrift, disconnects from the mainland; she risks being, for a time, storyless. And to be without a story -- to be without the conventional story of female becoming -- can be a deeply frightening experience since it is to be without a model and thus potentially to be on one's own, confronting the responsibility for authoring one's life. (p.72)

Susan was continually frustrated by trying to construct new stories of teaching and teacher education. She was afraid she would become the kind of teacher she did not want to be. Alternate possibilities did not seem to be encouraged. Susan seldom found what she considered to be examples of the stories she was trying to construct. She also felt discouraged by others who insisted on living a story of security. For Susan, the

conventional story provided only the false security of covering up what she did not know and left her feeling like an imposter.

In each class Susan found different stories being told, each with a different plot line. Soon after we began to work together, Susan described her experience in the following way. "I'm finding a lot of classes that are completely disjointed from one another and yet in an elementary school they're all going to have to be integrated into the same thing" (S2.6/7). This sense of disconnection continued as Susan struggled throughout her program to construct connections between the conflicting plot lines she was being presented and her own narrative knowing of education. I have chosen to represent the disjointed nature of the stories Susan shared with me during these three terms by presenting them as episodes. I feel episodes give a way to represent the fragmentation Susan was experiencing as she struggled to integrate her personal practical knowledge with the professional knowledge she expected to receive.

Susan also experienced a tension between the certainty she wanted to have in order to feel confident as a teacher and the desire to question and uncover the knowledge she was being presented. "I'm finding it a real crash course in something that I really don't have any perception of yet" (S2.6/7). "Covering the curriculum" did not allow Susan the time she really needed to think about and question underlying issues she became aware of throughout her program. The narrative knowing she valued for herself and her future students did not seem to count in her teacher education program.

> Social Studies is an important subject, sure. Science is an important subject, sure. But mostly what you're learning out of those things is how to make choices, how to deal with people, how to deal with your own problems, thinking about alternative ways to solve your problems, and how to take responsibility for your actions. You need to know how to get along with people, how to make choices, how to be responsible for your behavior. (S18.15)

I have chosen to focus on the themes of authoring, relationship, and knowing and to show ways in which various encounters with others shaped and were shaped by what Susan believed about herself as a teacher and learner. While authoring, relationship, and knowing were integral in each episode, I have chosen to highlight them separately in order to focus attention on the tensions Susan experienced. I have also chosen to construct three groups of episodes to correspond with the three terms we worked together. The first term I have named "Tied in Knots," the second term, "Tying and Untying," and the third term, "Off and Running." I have referenced Susan's parts of the stories by referring to the

transcripts as I did with Zach. For example (S5.18) refers to page 18 of transcript number 5. The dates of the transcribed conversations are recorded in Appendix B.

****

Tied in Knots (September to December, 1991)

There is something I don't know
that I am supposed to know.
I don't know *what* it is I don't know,
and yet am supposed to know,
and I feel I look stupid
if I seem both not to know it
and not know *what* it is I don't know.
Therefore I pretend I know it.
This is nerve-racking
since I don't know what I must pretend to know.
Therefore I pretend to know everything.

I feel you know what I am supposed to know
but you can't tell me what it is
because you don't know that I don't know what it is.

You may know what I don't know, but not
that I don't know it,
and I can't tell you. So you will have to tell me everything.

(R. D. Laing, 1971, p. 56)

Voice Training: Encounter Points with Authorship

During this term, Susan struggled to give voice to her knowing and to author her own stories of teaching and learning. However, she seemed to be going through a process of "voice-training" (Brown, 1991, p. 81) as she shaped her voice to fit the already authorized versions being presented to her in her teacher education program. Although the authorized versions being presented often did not connect with her narrative knowing of what was important, there was little space for her to question the stories she was receiving. Susan often found herself in the position of privately resisting the authorized stories while at the same time unable to find support that could enable her to articulate a version she felt was more connected with her narrative knowing.

Episode #1: The Interview: Whose Agenda is This?

One of Susan's first assignments in the Fall Term involved interviewing a teacher or a child about environmental issues and writing a paper based on the interview. While the assignment was presented in a straight forward manner on paper, Susan knew the actual process of constructing the paper would not be that simple. "You have to hand in the tape with a title page, a neatly written seven page double spaced paper with an introduction, discussion, reflection on your interview and implications for teaching. I mean it seems pretty straight forward on here, but when I go to interview someone it's going to seem like what am I doing?" (S1.3).

This assignment left Susan with an overwhelming sense of not knowing what to do. Interviewing a teacher or a child on his/her views of environmental education left Susan fearful. She worried about not knowing what kinds of questions to ask since she felt she knew little about environmental issues. In her own school experience "it was just don't litter and today we're going to pick up the litter and everyone groaned (laugh), you know. That was it. And nature walks, appreciate nature, but it never told you how to preserve it. Don't pick the flowers" (S1.2). Susan had taken a few related university courses, "like my Political Science course related to it, a few Economics, my Geography" (S1.1).

Susan was also aware there was much she did not know about interviewing. "I'm panicking. I don't know what I do with it. I wouldn't even know how to interview someone, especially a child. . . . I don't even have a clue where I'm going to find someone" (S1.1). Deciding whether to interview an adult or a child posed dilemmas as Susan weighed what she felt she knew, what she might learn, and the need for a good mark. "I wouldn't have the skills to interview a child. . . . And if you're interviewing kids I'll be marked on that skill. Although I would like to. . . . Here we come back to the marks, the practicality" (S1.1). At this point in our conversation, Susan laughed and said, "I could always switch your tape recorder on you" (S1.1). I agreed that she could interview me as a teacher, adding that I too knew very little about environmental issues.

Susan's belief in the myth of teacher as expert left her feeling like an imposter, especially if she chose to interview a child. She was concerned the child might look to her for answers when all she had were questions and more questions. Susan worried that a child might ask her questions she would be unable to answer. "I'm not an expert on environmental stuff so, is this child going to be looking to me for answers because he's going to walk away very confused. I don't have any environmental background at all. We didn't do that when I went to school" (S1.2).

Susan also needed to focus on a topic and "I don't even know where to start with that" (S1.2). As she began to imagine what would be involved in actually doing the assignment, her mind filled with questions and concerns. The answers Susan had expected to find in her courses were non-existent. Susan's belief that as a teacher she would be expected to be able to answer her students' questions was reflected in her expectations of her professors. "I just sort of felt like for an education course, the professor didn't deliver the lesson very well because I was very confused at the end and I asked about 100 questions" (S1.2).

After deciding to interview me, Susan needed to think her way through several issues before we actually did the interview three weeks later. She worried about asking appropriate questions. When we met for our second taped conversation, Susan had spoken to her professor and was feeling a bit more comfortable about the assignment.

However, Susan was still struggling to understand how the assignment would help her in learning to teach. "It's supposed to . . . help you . . . I don't know. Set priorities or sort of decide where your priorities are. But then I'll hand it in and that will be the end" (S2.11/12). Susan could not imagine how this written assignment could help her in an actual classroom. "I just feel like I know I'm going to learn all about environmental education, how to integrate it into my subjects, and I'm going to get out in school and figure out that I have so much to do just getting my act together and getting my class together -- that's just going to slip to the side" (S2.12).

Susan imagined a very different type of assignment as beneficial. "I'm taking one person's interview and I'm supposed to formulate my stand on this. I don't agree with that. I'd like to hear different people's views and find out what works in the class, what didn't work for them. Why they would never do it again, or why they would try it differently. That for me would be beneficial" (S2.12). While getting different points of view would mean "doing a lot of running around, and maybe a lot of imposing into different classrooms, but at least I would be in the environment that I will be in when I'm finished and learn how to deal with it in that framework" (S2.12).

When we did meet at Susan's place one Saturday to do the interview, it took several minutes before we actually pushed the record button. It seemed like jumping off a cliff. Our interview lasted 15 to 20 minutes while Susan asked me about my experiences of teaching environmental education. Susan seemed to feel a sense of relief when the interview was completed, but her troubles were just beginning. Susan phoned me later that weekend very concerned about what she was writing. She was worried about how she was critically interpreting what I had said. I told her not to worry about it. I also said it

might help her understand some of the dilemmas I would be going through when I began to write about her experiences as a student.

Many issues contributed to Susan's sense of writing what she felt her professor wanted to hear rather than writing to help her construct her own knowing. Her marks would come from what was valued by her professor, not herself. "It seems to me that my professor is setting out how to do it and a lot of the marks are coming for not content but did you present them the way I said" (S3.11).

Susan's paper became filled with differing perspectives imposed by our interview, the assigned reference material, and her professor's required format which Susan was trying to pull together into an integrated whole. She not only needed to take my construction of what environmental education means for me in my classrooms and fit it into a pre-established format, she also had to integrate reference materials from her assigned readings. "I'm not really happy with any of the references. It was really biased for one thing. It was all really geared to propaganda for teachers sort of thing. You're Superman so here's what you can do and this is all you have to do in three easy steps" (S3.3). There was little space for Susan's thoughts, her questions, her voice.

Susan described how she had "done a lot of stretching in this paper" (S3.2) in order to include what she believed her professor wanted to hear. Susan complied with the prescribed format and was determined to include quotes from the required readings even though the authors she quoted did not express her own views. Since she had read them, she wanted to get credit for it. "Now ordinarily I wouldn't even put that in, but I'm so tight for references. I read this whole bloody thing. I'm going to use it (laugh) you know. I want them to know that I did do the research" (S3.4). However, none of the perspectives fit with Susan's sense of what was important and left her feeling disconnected and unsure. Rather than finding support to help her explore her ideas, she felt her voice was silenced.

Susan felt manipulated into someone else's agenda. She struggled with separating the "data" into predetermined categories that did not fit her sense of what she wanted to say. Susan had again gone to talk to her professor in order to clarify for herself what was expected. However, she left feeling frustrated. "I said I find there's a lot of overlap in between my discussion and reflection and my implications for teaching. Is that not reflection? To me it is. My professor said if you're finding that, take it out of the discussion/reflection part and put it in the implications part. . . . I guess I have to use subtitles. . . . Oh, ok. So looking at what I've done then, I think my paper might be a bit redundant from what's being asked for" (S3.1). The connections Susan was trying to make were impossible within the predetermined categories. She felt she needed to write a paper that expressed the views of others, views she often disagreed with. She felt

compelled to publicly conform to an authorized cover story and disregard her own beliefs and concerns.

> It's almost like you're following a hidden agenda, and it's not your own. Like I'm not going to paint out that the system is great and everyone is environmentally aware and teachers are really morally upstanding citizens and this is a social value so they should push it in the school system. I don't buy that. That's a rosy picture. That's not reality. And I don't like having to read references that are not of my choosing that are really slanted and I thought a lot of them were. (S3.9)

Susan did not see this type of assignment as a valid research paper. Doing a 15 minute interview with one teacher provided "too limited a sample to really reflect on" (S3.12). Susan described the assignment as a form of "journalism" (S3.12) and felt she was being expected to produce a paper covering the positive aspects of environmental education when she wanted to uncover underlying assumptions and problems. "I mean it's a great goal, and it looks wonderful on paper, but what are the realities behind what's really going on? Isn't that what we're here to look at?" (S3.12).

The issues Susan needed to question were not part of the assignment agenda. Susan felt the purpose she had envisioned for the paper was not the intended purpose of her professor. When I asked why she was having so much difficulty writing the paper, she said, "I think it's the purpose. I had in my head a clear picture of what the purpose should be and found it hard to get away from what I thought it should be" (S3.6). While Susan was hoping to "get an idea of what's happening in the school system today" (S3.6), she felt the assignment had "such a narrow perspective. I think from this interview you should be able to draw in some ways, a broader knowledge of it. I mean not generalizing it to all teachers but a broader perspective of what the problems are and why they are the way they are" (S3.6).

The confusion Susan felt between what she was trying to accomplish and what she thought was expected led her to "feel like I should be rewriting this and I really don't have the time and I've put so much time into this already. That's really discouraging to think I have to start reworking the entire paper" (S3.7).

Susan explained the main point she was trying to emphasize in her paper was "that teachers have so many demands already that to put one more on them that they aren't trained for is unrealistic" (S3.5). She did manage to voice her concern about inadequate teacher training and pull together an excellent paper. When I asked Susan if she thought there would be opportunity to share the papers in class in order to explore a variety of

perspectives, she said, "No. I don't think we are. It's for a mark. It's for part of our grade and that's what it's for" (S3.6).

Episode #2: Making Choices

While Susan felt she was "ready to form my own conclusions, to make my own predictions, to be responsible to know what I would want to know" (S6.5), she felt "like no one's saying that you do know what you want to look for" (S6.5). Susan found little opportunity to make her own choices within her courses. "I think that it's a hard thing, especially at university, to conform to doing what you're told and that seems to be the way all my courses have been this semester. Doing what I'm told, and don't ask any questions because this is, see that's the leader and they have the power. I'm the follower. I have no power, you know" (S5.7). Susan's image of herself as a follower in her university courses contributed to her continual insecurity about becoming a teacher, who she saw as a leader in the classroom, when she felt she had never been given the opportunity to experience this role in her courses. Susan could not rely on herself until something or someone else validated her ideas.

When I asked Susan, "Does power have anything to do with control?" she thought carefully about the kind of teacher she would want to be. "I don't think I would want to be a teacher that had ultimate control. I think that I would want to be someone who said you could all be a leader if you want. Or if you didn't want to, that's your choice" (S5.8). As Susan thought more about choice, she said, "And that's really power in itself. Choice. Here I don't feel like I have a choice" (S5.8). Susan described choice as "something that I value" (S5.8). Having her choices invalidated left Susan feeling resistant. "If I have the choice, I'm more apt to do it willingly. If I don't have the choice, I'm more apt to say forget it. I'm not doing this. Or rebel or however you want to say" (S5.8).

Thinking about the importance of choice gave Susan another way to tell about her experiences this term. Susan usually enjoyed writing papers when "I have the choice of what I write, I have the choice of what I read, I have the choice of what I do, I have the choice of when I do it except it has to be done by a date" (S5.8/9), but this term had been very different. "The one that I did write this semester was no choice. You will write it this way. You will have a subheading, you will have an introduction that is this way" (S5.9). Susan had talked this over with her fiance, trying to vent her frustration and figure out why her attitude was going "from bad to worse." "I was saying I don't feel like I have any control over what's happening. And I don't feel like what's happening is doing me a lot of good. So it's certainly not doing anything for my attitude which has gone from bad to

worse. I think in a classroom I would have more choice. But I don't feel competent to go into a classroom so that's putting you into a spot again of what choice do I have?" (S5.9).

Making her own choices allowed Susan to feel both responsible and accountable for herself and the choices she made. "I've never really been one to say it's not me. I didn't do it. Don't blame me. I mean I'm sorry that you're angry with me but I did make the choice and looking back, I might have made it differently, but it's the choice I made and I can't change it" (S5.14). However, in order to make appropriate choices, Susan needed to have a clear sense of what the expectations were in the context of her coursework. Then she could "choose to get a poor mark or a good mark" (S5.13). Since her professors would be evaluating her papers and exams, she needed to know what each one's expectations were. "I think I write what I want to write but I also know what, it goes back to expectations again. What does this professor like? What does he hate?" (S5.13).

At times Susan felt ignored -- unseen and unheard as a person in her classes. If Susan's voice didn't fit the authorized version, others seemed deaf and she felt dumb. "It's not the fact that they have the power and I don't so much as the fact that they don't think that I should have (laugh), you know. If I ask a question, it's a neutral comment, remark, or an ignored remark, or we'll address that later" (S5.7/8).

Finding little choice open to her within her teacher education courses, Susan eventually chose to "conform to the teacher's agenda" as she became more and more frustrated by having her questions and concerns ignored. "You get kicked so many times or whatever or shot down so many times that you think what is the point? Why am I going to set myself up for feeling horrible for the next three hours? Why ask the question? and get snubbed, and feel like 'Ohhh that makes me mad.' Why do that? So there you go. You're conforming to the expectations of the teacher's agenda" (S6.16).

Episode #3: Planning with Lists and Webs

Another assignment that felt like an imposition on Susan's authority to construct her own meaning was a mind mapping assignment where she needed to design a lesson plan using a mind map. "I'd rather have a list (laugh). And if I want to make my list all messy and draw arrows, I'll do it, but I want a list (laugh). That's not the same as bubbles and linking words" (S5.12). Susan was again exasperated by trying to fit her ideas into someone else's format. She told me "Some of those things to me link, but they're not relevant to me so I wouldn't link them that way. But this assignment requires that you do link, no matter what. Link it. 'There's no link!'" (S5.12).

When I asked Susan how a list helped her, she explained lists helped her "organize, priorize. When I go home at the end of the day and look at my list or whatever, and see what I did and what I didn't do, I can say Ok, pat on the back, sit down and relax or boy, you better pull your socks up and let's get moving. And that's a standardized way for me to look at my behavior" (S5.12). Lists also helped Susan set up choices and expectations for herself. "I laugh when I make it because I think, I'm not going to do half the things on here but at least I know what has to be done. I guess that goes with preparation and everything again. I know what's expected of me" (S5.13). Susan might not do everything on her list. "I had the choice. Or I can be accountable for my choice" (S5.13).

Lists also helped Susan feel a sense of accomplishment. Susan described how she enjoyed "checking things off on my list. It makes me feel good" (S5.16). When I asked if this gave her "a sense of closure. This is finished. I'm done with that. What happens when something stays open for a long time?" Susan replied, "It bugs me to death. I think even going back to this probably redundant old theme, but, that's why I'm having problems again this semester, because I don't seem to be getting anything accomplished, you know. I don't feel like I've done anything" (S5.16).

Susan later designed an amazing lesson for her Environmental Studies class. The purpose of the lesson was to show ecological interdependence. Susan had the class form a circle and each person was given a card representing something living in our environment. Susan then had a string that threaded back and forth across the circle from person to person. When something was eliminated from the environment, the person representing it was to drop his/her hold on the string. Susan wanted the students to realize how this affected the tension of the string for everyone. "Like I don't think anyone is ever alone in anything. There's always a web, an interdependency or a relationship somehow" (S6.19). However, Susan emphasized how she had used a list to plan this lesson. "I just put them on paper. I have ten items. Here's my materials. Then I arranged them to be a list of a chain, right. So I guess an order, and then I tried to put them together in a meaningful way" (S6.19).

Susan explained how, as she worked through her list during planning, it helped her "to work it out in my mind and visualize how it would happen so that I was prepared when I went in there and the string didn't end up wrapped around five of my students' necks, you know, oops! (laugh). I guess I should have thought of that" (S6.25).

Susan also explained that she uses lists extensively in planning many areas of her life. "If I'm going on a trip, I cannot function unless I have a list. I have to put it all on paper, what needs to be done. It just keeps it organized for me. It helps me organize and

visualize what I'm doing. And I'm not the kind of person that wings out if this thing on my list doesn't go right. But I like, I guess it's being prepared, I don't know" (S6.20).

Susan gave me the following example of visualizing while writing a list. "I picture myself going to Super Store. Running up and down the aisles. Ok, that'll take me five, ten, probably 25 minutes. Oh, the lines might be long, I better allow for. But I do. And that comes through from experience. I've done it a million times. I know" (S6.21).

When I asked if lists might be a helpful way to make sense of what Susan was learning, she explained, "You see, I can picture a frog and I can picture a snake. They're all concrete objects. Feeling tone, motivation, that's not concrete. Like maybe I'm in the wrong field. Maybe I should be in a field where I'm working with concrete manipulation of objects. I'd probably do very well at it. But, I don't know. It's almost like overload for me, really. Too much stimulation all at once. I can't make sense of anything. I have all this incoming information and it's all going in one ear and out the other and I'm trying to find ways to make it meaningful so that I do remember it" (S6.21).

Lists seemed to provide key points for Susan in an experiential web. Each word on her list had many contingent meanings attached to it. Each word helped her to recall past situations. "When I'm making my list I think, like just going back to driving to Super Store, I'm driving to Super Store, but I know that the speed limit is 60 or whatever, and I know that driving 100 might get me there faster, and keep me on my schedule, but it won't be effective if I get into an accident or whatever. So maybe something procedural I can list it, taking into account other factors. Like if I was going to list how I would teach my lesson, I could list it and to put down on paper all the other factors is almost pointless to me because I think that I'm thinking of a lot of them already. It messes up my list (laugh)" (S6.23).

However, Susan had difficulty including on her list something with which she had no experience and thus no picture in her mind. "For this lesson plan I have my list of closure, set, interest, motivation, etcetera. So I can see how that would work. But this really throws a curve into it with this different, you know, come up with a unique, creative thing to teach and take all this into consideration. I'm like, 'That's not on my list!' (laugh). I'm not doing that!" (S6.20/21).

Susan seemed able to list the things she wanted to do, but how she would actually accomplish those things, the personal relationships and contingencies, could not be listed ahead of time. Perhaps her lists were a way to plot a route through experiential uncertainties and remind her where she was going when distractions pulled her off course.

Susan was required to analyze a reading series for her Language assignment and found this very useful. She was free to choose whichever reading series she wanted.

"The purpose of this one was analyze it and decide if you would use it or not. And I just looked through a bunch of them and thought well, there's no point in me going through a whole bunch that I wouldn't use. And that way, when I get into a school, if I, when I, I'll be familiar with it. I'll be able to know what I'm doing a bit better" (S5.15). Susan had chosen to look at the Impressions series and enjoyed the choices it gave to both herself and her future students. Also, some of the evaluation activities fit with Susan's valuing of lists. "Initially, when I picked it off the shelf, I wanted to see this big controversy over this series. But once I got looking at it, I thought, 'Oh, I really like this.' This has also all the checklists for the teacher but also student self-evaluation. And it's not just a bunch of workbooks and junk. It's activities and it's, in that project book the kids get to choose their activity so it would be interesting to them, hopefully. If you're going to choose it, it's going to mean more than if I choose it for you. So, yeah. And there was all this too. It's nice little things for the kids to have to fill in what I've accomplished today" (S5.16).

Relationships as Encounter Points

Susan learned to tell stories of objective and hierarchical knowing. However, as she tried to live these stories, she found herself disconnected from both herself and the people with whom she was trying to develop and maintain relationships.

Episode #1: The Alien

Susan had chosen Special Education as her focus area. Her brother's experiences of failure during his elementary program and his subsequent successes once he was identified as a special needs student led Susan to want to help children in similar situations.

Part of the story Susan was learning in one of her Special Education courses was the story of objective certainty. This story involved assessing the body of knowledge children had through tests which were valued for their objectivity, validity, and reliability. These tests would enable teachers to rank where a child stood in relation to others. Early in the term Susan looked forward to having the opportunity to practice doing an assessment with a child although she was not sure at this time what the assessment or the assignment would involve. This assignment ended up being another group assignment typical of her work this term. She and another education student, David, would do the assessment and write up the case study together.

This assignment did not turn out the way Susan imagined. The testing situation, done in partnership with David, was "not really a valid test because you would never have two adults administering a test to an individual" (S4.4). Susan also imagined that having

two adults administering the test would be "sort of threatening" (S4.4) to the child. Susan again felt placed in a very artificial situation for this assignment.

While Susan did not "really know what this test measures, my experience with these tests are quite limited but this is the Canadian Achievement Test given through K to 12. It's the biggie that everyone gets. So I mean obviously it does have some validity or it wouldn't be there. You would hope" (S6.8). Susan gained confidence in her ability to evaluate the test when "the test critiques agreed with what I thought" (S6.8). However, the information she had received in her coursework had not prepared her to know how to relate to a child. "I just really felt unnatural. I deal with adults every day of my life right now. So to deal with a child it was sort of like, 'Oh, what do I say?'" (S6.8).

When I asked Susan what happened when she and David went to do the assessment with John, she told me, "I felt like I didn't know, I was sitting with an alien" (S6.6). The disembodied voice from the standardized wording of the assessment form Susan felt compelled to use left her feeling disconnected from her own voice, her knowing, and her ability to develop a relationship with John, the little boy in front of her. "I felt like I was looking at this script, thinking back to my university, what am I supposed to say? It was so unnatural. I felt really unnatural with this kid and I thought picture yourself now in front of 30 of these little guys (laugh) and I just about started sweating right on the spot. I thought, 'I think I'll snap'" (S6.6).

Susan knew John had been tested previously and had found out from his teacher that he was "a poor speller. Or he thinks he knows he is. He was told he is, by a teacher who knows everything, right" (S6.16). Susan also knew she was to follow the "script" in the testing manual in order to get objective test results. The words that came naturally to her were not part of the standardized assessment manual's directions. Susan was torn between following the script in the manual and relating to the child in front of her. "It told you what to say and there were a lot of times, when he said, 'Oh, I'm a really poor speller,' and I know that I shouldn't have said this, because it wasn't in my script, I said, 'Oh, John, you just whizzed through all these tests. You're doing so well, you can't be that poor in spelling. You're doing reading. You're reading fluently.' I mean how do you make a kid that age understand when he's been told that he's a poor speller? He scored in the 85th percentile in that test. Overall, and in the 95th percentile in the other two tests" (S6.6/7).

When Susan told me John's "results," I was excited. I assumed Susan or David would immediately call John or his mother to share the good news since John had already been informed of previous test results where he had done poorly in spelling. I felt this could give him more confidence in himself as a speller and a learner. When I asked Susan

if she was going to let John and/or his mother know the test results, she explained, "But you see that's not ethical. We're not supposed to give the results to the child" (S6.7).

Episode #2: Connecting With People (Working Together)

Susan began the term determined to get involved and meet people. Her past two years had not provided much opportunity to develop bonds with other students since everyone seemed to be taking different courses at different times. However Susan had made some friends and hoped to make even more this year. Susan found it hard to get into a routine at first. "I'm trying to develop a routine. And with seeing all these people I haven't seen for four months, it's hard to develop a routine because I go home and I'm by myself, so this is my social interaction" (S1.14). Susan valued conversations with friends and needed to find spaces for these conversations in her routines. "I'm going to have to figure out when people's breaks are and stuff" (S1.14). Susan was pleased to have seen at least one person she already knew in most of her classes. "So far in all my classes except for one I have someone that I know" (S1.13). Susan also intended "to meet people out of the class" (S1.13) by becoming involved in student council functions.

During this professional year Susan hoped to develop more connections with other students, her future colleagues. She became part of the education students' Special Education council executive as a way to get involved. Susan also encouraged others to become involved since she felt that "you're going to end up working with these people and running into them here and there. Wouldn't it be nice to know their name and to say 'Hey, wasn't that funny when we went for lunch that day,' or when we decorated that Christmas tree that year or whatever. I just think that it's beneficial that way" (S7.8).

As the term progressed, I watched Susan's circle of friends grow. She sat in the lounge with a group of Special Education students discussing course work, assignments, and other issues important to developing connections in education and to each other. Susan described this group as a "resource" (S5.1).

Working on the student council was a different story. On a personal level Susan "did meet good people" (S7.7) and "it just made me feel more of a part of what's happening" (S7.7). Susan also described how her relationships with her professors changed once they knew she was on the council. "This sounds really terrible, but with my professors, when they know that you're on council and everything else, I don't know, something about their attitude just changes about you and they're friendlier towards you and, you know, if you ever need something or extra help or a book to read you can go in there and they know who you are and where you're from" (S7.7).

However, connections were more formal and hierarchically ordered within the actual student council organizations. Rather than facilitating communication among students and building a connected sense of community, Susan found the council members lived by and perpetuated hierarchical relationships. Susan described the general education students' council as the most prestigious. "That [general] council is elite and ours [Special Education] is an affiliate so we're for some reason considered second rate. Less important and we're supposed to be working together with them but no one wants to work together" (S7.7). Susan described the general council as exclusive. "Exclusive membership, exclusive information, exclusive parties, exclusive involvement" (S7.7).

Susan commented that the whole thing seemed to be "upside down." She felt it was her responsibility as a general student council member to represent the students as a whole, keep them informed of what was happening, and take their concerns to the council meetings. When information about whether or not there would again be a third year quota was presented, Susan was told this was privileged information to be kept under cover and not repeated outside the meeting. Susan was angry and frustrated. "I'm representing the students, so why should I be careful to whom I'm telling this information? Why is this privileged, top secret information? It affects everyone here. Not just people on the council" (S7.6).

Susan also felt the council members dealt with issues in a superficial way. The issue of the third year quota was "just a number on an agenda" (S7.5) while time was spent focusing on fund raising. Susan seemed unsure how issues were chosen for the agenda, but felt again that this was not the students' agenda. When I asked, "So what input do the students get?" Susan replied "Zero" (S7.5).

Attending meetings and being available to students during designated office hours, although few students actually dropped in to the office, was one of Susan's duties as a council member. "I can't be chunking out 15 hours a week to meetings" (S7.10). Susan imagined this could work differently. Rather than each person having a designated "position" and "job description," Susan felt rotating duties among all members would improve networking and a sense of community. "Then it wouldn't be just Oh 'them' in the general council office. It would be 'us.' We are together" (S7.10). Susan believed "we should be working for a common purpose instead of against one another. . . . So that was my suggestion to sort of make the ties a bit stronger and also show that we are interested in, rather than just fulfilling my two office hours a week in contributing, you know, each member" (S7.10). However, again, Susan's story of connection did not fit the authorized hierarchical version.

In her classes, Susan also experienced different kinds of connections in her relationships with her professors. Susan valued being seen as a person, not just a student. Susan also imagined herself as responsive to the feelings of her future students. "I think I'm pretty sensitive to others. I always can remember what it felt like when so and so said 'Well you stand up and pay attention,' you know, in front of the whole class. 'I'm sorry, I'm sorry.' Or 'Gee, that's just sloppy work,' you know. So I think I am sensitive in that respect and I would be aware of it" (S4.13). Susan believed it was a teacher's responsibility to take into account the feelings and concerns of students and she had little tolerance for professors who did not seem to acknowledge her in this way.

Near the end of the term, several people in one of Susan's classes were asking for an extension on an assignment. One of the students in the class commented on there being so many "whiners" in this class. Susan disagreed with this interpretation and spoke up. "Well I don't know if I entirely agree with that. I said, 'To elaborate a bit more, you go to the person who's the most receptive and understanding of your position and to my experience this semester, she would be the one I'd go to', or . . . a person. A person. Not Dr so-and-so" (S6.17).

Episode #3: Group Work

While Susan highly valued the rapport developed during "social interactions" with others during breaks from her classes and saw these interactions as a "resource" for her own learning, the group assignments she was required to do for her courses were filled with complex tensions.

One way Susan worked in groups was in-class discussion and activity groups. While there were benefits, "It got very old and stale. Like right now I could care less if I work in another group in my life. Every single class we were broken into groups. Every single class. Well, after a while, that just gets boring" (S7.3). Susan imagined that as a teacher this overuse of a good thing would lead to bored students and management difficulties. "You want to group children in groups but, if you're doing the same things all the time, what kind of class management will you have? You're class will be completely out of control because everyone's bored to death" (S7.3).

At times during group discussions "someone will ask a question and we will go into a discussion and people offer information and that's helpful" (S4.10). Susan also described a class which was "all group discussion and it's really not discussion" (S4.10). Here articles and accompanying questions were handed out to all students. Susan and the other students were to read the article and find answers to the questions. "Then every group shares it and redundantly repeats everything" (S4.10). Susan was annoyed and

bored by the repetition. "Hearing it repeated and discussing the meaning are two different things and we're not discussing the meaning" (S4.10). Susan was annoyed when these group discussions were closely monitored by the professor. Susan often felt the connections she was making between the article to be discussed and her own experience were seen as "off track" (S4.10) by her professors. Susan valued the opportunity to construct her own meaning and, when she got an implicit message from professors that she was off track, she would "just keep merrily talking about what I was talking about and then refer back to the article. I challenge anyone to say that's not meaningful. Are we going to memorize the article, or discuss what it means? And if we're going to discuss what it means, then isn't experience part of what it means? Or did we all walk into this article as a blank slate and gee, I know it now. Thank you for making that clear to me (laugh). This article clears everything up" (S4.10).

While Susan had hoped to develop some confidence in her teaching ability, she found the group assignments made her feel more dependent and insecure in her own abilities "because in a group, you have someone else to say, 'Hey, what do you think of this?' or 'What about this?' which I enjoy, but you need to have a balance because otherwise you get feeling like I do in that you're dependent on someone else always to help you with your work. Well, I'm not probably going to have that someone else every time I make up a lesson" (S7.2).

This fear was realized when Susan was given the final assignment for one of her courses. She had been encouraged and expected to work in groups throughout the term, and was then given a final independent assignment worth 40% of her mark. Susan was shocked. "Where did this come from? You didn't prepare me to do this on my own. You prepared me to work in a team, you know. You have to either do both, and do them well, or do one or the other. If your focus is on group, then teach people how to effectively work in a group. If your focus is on individual, then teach that skill. But don't just throw someone into the other skill and say well, you should know how to do both" (S7.4). Susan described her feelings about doing an individual assignment in the following way. "I felt completely unprepared after going from a group of four, teaming, that was the objective in that group. So all of a sudden being thrown on your own, I feel like I was being fed to the sharks" (S7.2).

When it was finally time for Susan to be allowed to try her hand at developing lesson plans, the scripted nature again silenced her own voice which needed to be replaced with the proper words that came from the mouths of authorities. Not only did she need to script them, but these were done as group assignments where Susan was required to work with others to come up with a script that included all the required components of a good

lesson plan. Just as Susan was beginning to sense the opportunity of having input, she often had to silence her voice depending on how the group as a whole wanted the lesson to be developed. "And it's hard. That's what Cheryl and I were talking about last night after our group meeting. I said 'I'm sorry if my attitude prevailed,' because I know for a fact that it did. I let out this big 'Ahhhhh!' and she said 'What!?' and I said 'You changed my entire part! I worked three hours on it and now I feel like I'm unprepared,' and I hate feeling unprepared -- for something that you need to be prepared for, you know" (S5.2).

Susan found it easier to work with people she knew because "you have some idea where they're coming from as far as their ideas, maybe even their experience. And their approach to a classroom might be different than yours, but that's valuable too" (S5.2). She described how knowing people gives you "a basis to go on almost. You'd have established a rapport and yes, I know this about you and I don't like it, but I'm aware of it and I don't have to find out half way through my assignment that you're driving me up the wall. I'm prepared to come into that situation that I have to do this assignment and I have to get along with you" (S5.2). Susan believed as a teacher she would have more freedom to choose who to work with. "You're around each other every day. You may or may not talk, but that's your choice" (S5.2).

At times the group work went well, particularly when the group was composed of "really good people" (S4.3). Susan described these people as having "good ideas and they're all conscientious workers so I know when it comes to getting it done, it'll get done and everyone will want to do a good job so they'll be really helpful and not 'Well we can't meet today'" (S4.3).

At other times Susan was filled with frustration. One thing that led to Susan's sense of frustration was the number of group assignments. "I just have so many group assignments coming up it's ridiculous" (S4.3). Other tensions were present in actually carrying out the group assignments. One initial difficulty was scheduling a meeting time. This problem was compounded by other simultaneous group assignments and exams.

Susan's attempt to choose people to work with based on her past experience of them did not always work out as she had hoped. In the child assessment assignment Susan had chosen to work with David "because we had worked in a group and we had worked well together" (S7.11). However, this time, "it ended up being I'll pull the weight and you take up the slack" (S7.11). After assessing the child, Susan and David needed to prepare a handout for their class presentation and write up a case study. Susan had compiled the information for the handout and "he typed it out onto a handout that was a poor quality. No subheadings, no double spacing, difficult to read, spelling errors" (S7.11). Susan was annoyed and worried about the mark they would receive. She

decided to re-do the case study herself. "I did it all. Re-did the entire thing. I was up until 12:30 doing it last night" (S7.11). When Susan needed to contact David for missing information, "he had gone away for the weekend" (S7.11). David phoned Susan Sunday night at 9:00 to ask "How are things going?" (S7.11). Susan replied, "Well, not too well because I needed this information to complete this assignment" (S7.11). When I talked to Susan on Monday, she was relieved the assignment was "done and out of the way. But yeah, it gets annoying. And especially when you're stressed out, it's very wearing" (S7.11).

Encountering Different Ways of Knowing

I remember how excited Susan was to be finally getting into her third year, a year she imagined would pull all the pieces of the previous years together. Susan expected the professional knowledge she would need to know would finally be revealed and would give her the confidence she needed to become a teacher.

Susan had hoped to gain a variety of perspectives which she would be able to fit together in order to have a more holistic picture of what would be involved in teaching. However, the variety of perspectives Susan experienced did not materialize in the way she had hoped. "Nothing fits. I have a puzzle. It's four different puzzles and I don't even have all the pieces" (S5.9). Susan's encounters with different ways of knowing were not made explicit in her program. Often the authorized story of one way of knowing being explicitly told was implicitly contradicted in the telling. While I present these explicitly as separate dilemmas, for Susan, they were experienced as simultaneous tensions leading to a state of confusion and frustration.

Dilemma #1: Questions and Answers

Susan experienced a continual tension between feeling there were right answers, a view of knowledge she had come to know in her public schooling, and a strong desire to question those answers and imagine different possibilities.

Susan was overwhelmed with the incoming information. "I feel like I'm reading and reading and reading chapter after chapter after chapter saying, 'This is all going to be expected of me,' and yet I don't feel like I've questioned it so how can I know it?" (S2.19). The time Susan needed to discuss the issues presented was seldom available. Susan became more upset as she was exposed to a variety of issues and perspectives she needed to take into account but was not allowed the time to do so. Susan had no time to question the information to figure out what she understood. "I think you have to question

something first, and think about everything, and then you'll sort of come to terms with whether you know it or not" (S2.19).

Susan vividly remembered a comment made by one of her Special Education professors last year. "On the first day, and throughout the class, and then in the last class she told us that Special Ed is a field where there's very few answers" (S2.17). I was surprised when Susan went on to tell me, "And I know in Language Arts there is a right answer and that's where we come back to learning styles and everything else. There's not a recipe. But I don't feel like I'm learning the basics" (S2.17). When I asked what made her think it was possible to have right answers, Susan replied, "It seems to me my profs feel there's a right answer. Some of the students feel there is a right answer. They're just not letting me in on it (laugh)" (S2.17).

Susan struggled between trying to gain the knowledge she felt her professors must have while at the same time feeling shut out when she began to question that knowledge. "I ask a lot of questions and I really get the impression that they're not overly happy to see your hand up" (S3.15). When Susan's questions pointed to some of the underlying dilemmas in education, she often felt shut down and ignored as she was told to stick to the curriculum being covered in the present course. "It's almost like they're impatient. 'We just did it and this is the way you do it so why are you questioning my method?'" (S3.15).

While Susan was questioning in order to get a better understanding of the concepts and how they might relate to her future classroom practice, she believed her questions were often heard as a demand for the professors to justify what they were presenting. "Everyone seems really sensitive to the fact that why are you questioning my knowledge? I'm not questioning you personally, I'm just questioning period" (S4.9). Susan often sensed her professors had a course to "cover" that took precedence over her needs and interests as a student. Susan often found questions asked by other students relevant to what she wanted to know. However, they were not acknowledged as part of the teacher education course curriculum, but were seen by professors as personal questions to be dealt with out of class. For example, "We were talking about circus days and how that's really relevant to kids and they get excited about it and how you could go so many directions with it. So someone brought in the fact about Springtime. Could you not sort of do the same idea, or how would you structure this so it would work for a spring lesson and my professor said, 'Well, I'll answer that after class if you want to come and ask me.' And I thought, 'I think everyone in here is quite interested in the answer to that question and it's very relevant,' but it didn't fit the plan" (S4.9). Susan fumed inside, feeling that only certain kinds of things were allowed to be open for discussion.

The questions Susan asked in order to help her connect her narrative knowledge to what was being presented in class were often discounted. When one professor had "suggested that we do this and not have a time limit" (S3.15), Susan had asked, "Well what about those students that are really geared to working with a deadline?" (S3.15). Her professor had replied, "Well, I don't think you'll get that" (S3.15). This answer did not fit with Susan's narrative knowing of herself. "I'm thinking well I know I will because I used to be that way myself. I like to know and I'm still that way. When is our exam? What does it cover? I like to plan that way. That's just the way I am. That's one of my idiosyncrasies" (S3.15). Even when Susan tried to voice her concern again, it was not heard. "I said, 'What if I do?' about three times. But, 'You won't get it.' Ok. I'll take your word for that (laugh). . . . Well, I'm not supposed to have that question (laugh). They told me I wouldn't get it so quit being out of line (laugh). Don't think so much" (S3.15).

Susan found herself forced to answer questions and complete assignments on a superficial level to get the marks even when she felt totally confused by the underlying issues she was trying to grapple with. Again, she felt like she was being focused toward learning the authorized stories while focusing on discussing the underlying issues was forbidden or ignored. "I think that when it comes to teaching you obviously want to look at it as positively as you can or you'd be miserable all the time, but is it realistic to say that what we always do and what we've done in the past has been great?" (S3.13).

Susan began to realize it would be much easier just to do the assignments and not question. Her questions seemed to keep her from completing required assignments. They left her feeling frustrated and angry. Susan began to think living the story of covering the required curriculum rather than questioning it was what was expected. "It seems that a lot of my energy is being wasted into thinking about why rather than everyone else just doing it, you know. So I pondered why for this assignment for two weeks when I could have had it finished and been done" (S4.9).

Dilemma #2: Becoming a Trained Professional

Susan had expected a very different type of "training program" than what she was receiving. "In any training program they usually have an artificial test, pilot run and then they put you into the real situation and pull you back out and say 'Woah. You messed up. You forgot about A, B and C and what were the fundamentals there that you didn't do?'" (S2.13). Susan could not make sense of her program which was structured so differently from what she had expected. She was overwhelmed with the diversity of ideas she was

being presented and had no idea how to combine these ideas or select an appropriate perspective. "We're not even learning A, B and C, we're just sort of learning everything all at once and it's all running together and it's not running together and you're trying to make the connection but there is no connection sometimes. You're sort of left" (S2.13).

Within the first week of classes, Susan began to have misgivings about having her expectations met. Susan became more and more concerned as she became aware of how complex teaching is. Susan felt her courses were raising her awareness, but not providing her with the "background knowledge" (S1.6) she felt she needed. Susan began to realize what she considered to be the professional knowledge of the teacher as expert was fraught with dilemmas and ambiguities she had never imagined during the first two years of her program. She was being awakened to issues without being given any ideas of how to handle them. Since Susan was trying to live and tell a story of teacher as expert, she felt she would be expected to have the answers if she were not to be an imposter in the classroom. "If I know what I'm doing and I know my area well, I'm a confident person. But I can't see how they're expecting everyone to be confident in something they know nothing about. Yet they're not providing me with the information that's going to give me the confidence that I will need" (S2.10). Rather then being presented a package of professional knowledge, Susan felt the cover had been lifted as it had on Pandora's box and she was left to deal with the resulting dilemmas and uncertainties on her own. However, closing the cover would destroy any hope of resolving the issues of which Susan had become aware.

She struggled to articulate this tension in the following way. "I don't want a recipe. It would be lovely to have one. . . . But at least if I had a <u>standard</u> recipe and then create my own from here. Here's the basic ingredients and this is how they connect. I don't feel like I'm getting basic ingredients. I feel like I've been turned loose in Super Store (laugh) and told to 'Make something that is good'" (S2.17). Since Susan had no idea what to choose or how to combine the choices she might make she felt incapable of constructing a meaningful program for her future students. "How about Kraft macaroni? That's what I'm going to get. A recipe lesson plan I'm sure. That's how I feel right now. But I didn't want to go out there being the 'safe teacher' the one that follows the way it's always been done, because I don't agree that the way it's always been done is the best way. But if it gets to the point of whether I'm going to be able to survive in the classroom or not, then I might choose the safe way. Or when it gets so overwhelming then it's easier for my sanity to go to the safe way" (S2.18).

Susan was also getting the message from her professors to stick with what was familiar. "And it seems like that's what they're teaching us. . . . Pick a safe lesson plan,

pick a safe subject. . . . Pick something you know about" (S2.18). Susan saw little space or support for the risks involved in exploring new possibilities.

Susan was shocked at the flexibility of the curriculum. She had imagined there was a standardized curriculum for each grade level that all children would learn. Seeing the Science curriculum divided only into "division one, division two. Suggested activities" (S2.1) left Susan disoriented, confused, and terrified, as if the rug had been pulled out from under her. She imagined that if students came into her class having received instruction in different areas, teaching would be very difficult. "I mean that makes your task so much more complex and that's a hard enough thing to do anyway if you have 30 students" (S2.2). Not only was she now aware that children had individual abilities, but now she realized they might have different curriculum backgrounds as well. She could not imagine how she could teach under such conditions. "But if you have 30 students coming from 15 different places, do you have group A, group B, and group C? Group A learned this, group B learned that, group C learned that. How do you teach anything then? Just stumble around in the dark until you find something that works?" (S2.2). In order to be a good teacher, Susan felt she would need to know what she was doing. "If I'm going in there expecting that I'm going to know half about what I'm doing, how is this going to work?" (S2.2). For Susan, this meant knowing correct procedures and answers. She felt her concern with uncertainty was not addressed within her program.

Susan knew there was a difference between knowing something herself and being able to teach someone else. Her sense of herself as a learner did not help her imagine herself as a teacher. For Susan, these were two different stories. "Ok, so I've gotten my nines in my essays and I've gotten my nines on my exams and I've proven to myself that I am a competent learner. Now, how am I a competent teacher?" (S2.19/20). Susan seldom felt the opportunity to explore her own knowing. Susan also felt she needed to examine how she had constructed her own knowing in order to be able to help others learn. "I feel like I need to relearn the procedure and think about how I learned it to know it in the first place to be able to pass it on" (S2.20). Susan was frustrated in her courses when there was no attention paid to uncovering the process of how she came to know what she did. Susan wanted to spend time uncovering her taken-for-granted assumptions; however, "they're counting on the fact that you know all this stuff so we don't have to discuss it. It's become so automatic that I don't know it anymore. And I don't know how I would teach it" (S2.15/16).

Susan ended the term still having the feeling that her expectation of becoming a "trained professional" would not be realized. "I had expected to go through four years of

university training coming out being a trained professional and I won't be a trained professional. I'll be an amateur (laugh) you know. An apprentice really" (S6.1).

Dilemma #3: Putting Theory into Practice

Susan knew the theoretical concepts she was receiving in her university courses would look very different in lived classroom situations, but she could not imagine how to effectively bring these theories to life. Susan knew she was getting only part of the story. While she felt that within herself "the awareness is there" (S1.6), she had a terrible sense of foreboding. "I have this terrible feeling though that I'm going to go out into the school and have these expectations (laugh) and get tuned into the real world (laugh). This is how you thought they would work, well this is how they work" (S1.6). Connections between the abstractions of paradigmatic knowing and the contingencies of narrative knowing were missing. "There's been no conceptual, this is the concept, what do you think of this concept, how would it work in your classroom? How would it not work? What are the difficulties you would see? What if you had someone like this in your classroom, how would you modify your lesson etcetera to suit the needs of this child?" (S2.4).

Susan described her course work at the university as "completely artificial. There's nothing in here that is true to the real classroom except that we're all students but at this level we're all responsible for our marks, we're responsible for attending class. It's not even the same ball game. I feel like the environment is so artificial" (S2.12). Susan had no image of a classroom full of children to help her contextualize the concepts she was supposedly learning in her class. "Even if you could get in with four or five teachers and stick with them for a month, and have these lectures on activities, ideas. How to present them, how to put them into a developmental thing" (S2.12).

Talking about classroom management was another area of concern for Susan. "Today we talked about feeling tone and winning over. What are some of the activities you could do in your classroom to establish a good feeling tone and to win over your students. So we all went out in the hall, made up our chart, did our ideas, came back in, put them up on the wall. My professor said they're going to stay up there so it might be beneficial for us to look at them. And that was it. But you didn't show me anything, or we didn't even discuss these activities. Like, a lot can go wrong between having personalized your classroom, and actually personalizing your classroom. There's a lot of steps in there that we're missing. You're telling me what to do, but I'm missing a procedure in here" (S2.11).

Susan was also aware she needed to consider "developmentally appropriate tasks" (S2.3), but she could not imagine what these might look like in practice. "They're assuming that you know automatically what level is appropriate for what or that you're going to discover it as you get into the classroom" (S2.3). Susan's hope to "discover that now so I have something to work with once I get there" (S2.4) seemed to recede further and further into the distance.

Talking and reading about teaching and children did little to help Susan figure out how to work with children. "I would like some children. Not of my own (laugh) but just to use for a day. Or even some discussion about how, why this would work with children, why it wouldn't work, what would you have to do differently with this presentation to make it to that level" (S2.5). However, Susan found no opportunity within her program to make the professional knowledge she was acquiring part of her personal practical knowing. Susan knew the system had "changed since I went to school" (S1.7), but did not understand how "for someone who hasn't gone through the system" (S1.7), she could be expected to teach something she had not experienced herself.

Susan could not find her bearings within the material being presented. "I feel like I'm learning [Grades] 1 to 6 as if it's a . . . bowl of soup. And I'm going to be digging around for the alphabet (laugh). They're in here somewhere" (S2.20). Susan did not feel she was learning in ways "to not make my kids feel dumb. Not make myself look dumb" (S2.20).

As the term progressed, the sense of disconnection between the information Susan was receiving and her narrative knowing was reinforced. "I feel like I'm learning about this stuff now, but not having it apply long term. I'm learning about it now, get my mark, get my credit, get my degree, and then I'm going to go out there and learn how to do it. That's how I feel" (S2.13). Susan also felt that once she started teaching, she would need to "rely on herself" but did not find spaces in her program to develop the confidence to do so. "I feel like I'm going to have so much work to do when I'm finished this. I'm going to know where the resources are and how to use them, but that's it. From there it's going to be trial and error and if it works it works and if not you're relying on yourself. And that's it" (S2.16). Susan did not see trial and error as a form of inquiry or reflective practice.

On the one hand Susan was overwhelmed by what she was getting; on the other hand she was overwhelmed by what she did not know. There was little time, opportunity, or support to make the connections that for Susan were essential. Susan described one class when she was given the opportunity to connect what was being taught to her personal practical knowing. "We had a practical application writing sort of seminar. How to write.

How to do a writing lesson and it was good. We went through it and did it ourselves. We talked about how you would present it to students. We did it ourselves. Did it in partners just like it was suggested. Shared our ideas in the class and we went through the process ourselves. So it really got you thinking well, yes I agree, maybe I'd do that a little different. From my experience in doing it I felt this way and in order for my students to feel better about that I would maybe change this. It really gave you something to work with" (S3.14/15). At other times the lack of time for discussion made the practical experience feel like a waste of time. "Doing a plot study for 45 minutes and discussing how to use it in your classroom for ten minutes is really screwed up. I don't really learn anything from that and it just makes me angry. You're wasting my time and I'm paying good money to go out and measure a meter square plot in the grass (laugh)" (S3.14).

Susan often could not visualize the abstract descriptions she was being given being enacted in practice. "We're getting all the 'should' and 'why you should' and 'it's better for the learner,' you know, but the how is lacking there. I mean I could probably whip off a heck of a writing lesson, or a Language Arts lesson that would integrate to all my subjects, but I'm just having a hard time thinking of myself here and myself there because it's different and I can't visualize that to myself. I try to visualize every lesson that I do as being presented to my class. And I try to think of ideas that I could do in my classroom that would make my learning fun, make my students enjoy what they're doing. But I'm not, I can't see that. Some days I can and some days I think Woah!" (S6.3/4).

Susan's emphasis on learning how was an expression of her need for the practical experience that would help her make sense of the theory. She could not imagine the personal relationships in a situation she had not experienced. "Well [she] said for this lesson, picture, visualize your students. Sort of make them personal to you and I'm having a really hard time doing that" (S6.5).

Dilemma #4: Relevance and Imposition

Susan began the term hopeful she would have the opportunity to reflect critically on personal and professional issues in teaching. She wanted to hear a variety of perspectives in order to clarify or expand her own knowing. Susan described the importance of interaction through conversation to help her reflect on and expand her thinking. "I like hearing what other people have to say and sometimes you're thinking that but they can express it better. Maybe you're struggling to express your thoughts. And when they say it, you're like 'That's it! That's what I was trying to say'" (S1.9). Interaction through conversation could also help Susan "put on the brakes and think for a minute rather than

just continuing on with what I was doing in my own merry way" (S6.23). However, in many of her classes, there was little opportunity for conversation about issues Susan found relevant as her professors tended to focus on telling Susan what they felt she needed to know. She spoke of "telling" as a "one-sided conversation" (S6.23).

Susan was pleased some of her courses "seem to be thinking courses which I like" (S1.10). She hoped these courses would "get you to sort of think about who you are and why you are who you are. And how you are will affect your teaching" (S1.10). Susan appreciated it when her views were asked for, listened to, and discussed. She described how she felt it was important to take time to think about her own values and become aware of "your biases. And it's good too because how many times do you really sit down and think about yourself that way. Usually you're so busy thinking a hundred things" (S1.10). Susan hoped her university courses would provide the opportunity to "really evaluate yourself carefully" (S1.10) since she knew once she started teaching there would be little opportunity to take time to think.

Susan was annoyed when her courses did not provide time to make personal connections with the materials presented. In one class Susan had been asked to read the textbook and list pertinent points. "I learned how to copy out of a text book in Grade 6!" (S1.8). Listing would have been fine as an initial step. However, the learning stopped there. "No introspection, no reflection, no anything. List them" (S1.8). This lack of space for reflection surfaced dramatically again when one student became very irate over the content of a recommended text book series. Susan was disturbed by this student's outburst, as well as by the way the professor seemed to ignore the outburst. "I thought here's an elementary teacher that is so firm in her belief that she's almost, she's screaming and yelling and just about crying and everyone was sort of, you know, disturbed by what's going on, but no one addressed it. I though that the prof should have addressed why she was upset and how her bias might affect her classroom. Not even her, single her out, how <u>our</u> biases affect our classrooms. That was an example right there that could have been, well should have been, I think, discussed and that's just again like it didn't happen" (S2.10).

Susan knew that everyone has different perspectives and wanted to learn how to deal with that in her classroom. "I think that you have to consider other people's perspectives and you have to be sensitive to the fact that your perspective is not everyone else's. They differ extremely from one to the other. And I think that that was important, as an educator, yes, it's very important. But you see we didn't even discuss <u>that</u> in class" (S2.10). However, this situation only made Susan aware of one more thing she did not know how to deal with.

The pressure of multiple assignments gave her little time to think about what she was doing. There seemed to be no time to reflect on her assignments or herself as a teacher. "With all these assignments coming up I really haven't had a moment to sit down and carefully look them over and say 'This is what I need to do'" (S4.4/5).

Susan was receiving a pervasive message that summarized the conflict she was experiencing. "We want to promote lifelong learning. Your assignment is due on Monday. And that's it. Your assignment's finished" (S6.2).

Dilemma #5: Isn't it All the Same Thing?

In the Special Education courses Susan had taken previously, she had focused on the individual needs and differences of students. She expected to get the rest of the story in her Curriculum courses to help her deal with these individual students. However, what Susan experienced seemed part of a different story. "But Special Ed is being completely separated for me" (S2.7). Susan found no mention of children with special needs in her Elementary Education courses outside of her Special Education courses. "It really makes me angry. They're talking about mainstreaming all of these kids within the next 10 years. But even the teacher that's teaching this Language Arts doesn't have any Special Ed background" (S2.7). Because Susan knew "within each classroom there's going to be kids that are slow and kids that pick up really quickly" (S2.7), she wanted to know "why and what to do about it and we're not getting that at all" (S2.7). Susan was concerned that while "each child in your class has special needs, we're not learning how to teach to individual needs we're learning how to teach . . . a lesson. . . . Like how to get everyone's interest. Well, if you don't understand A and we're on to B, how are you going to be interested in B? And what am I going to do about it? Well, if I don't even understand where your problem is, I'm going to be frustrated with this student as a teacher and that's really going to come through and that's the problem" (S2.8). Susan believed a "background in Special Ed" (S2.8) should be "mandatory" (S2.7) for all elementary teachers.

The story Susan knew of her brother as a special needs student and her belief in the importance of focusing on individual students did not seem to be a part of her Curriculum courses. She felt her brother had suffered through his elementary program because his teachers became frustrated when they did not have the training to understand him or his needs. "And that's what happened exactly to my brother. Through six years of elementary school. They tried to teach him. This is how they told us the curriculum goes. This is how they told us the learning process works, as much as they know, and why

don't you fit?" (laugh) (S2.8). Susan felt her brother had been seen as a misfit "whereas we should be, I think, concentrating more on the student and seeing how they fit. Not how they fit the curriculum, how the curriculum will fit them" (S2.8). When Susan asked questions in class connected with her previous knowing in her Special Education courses, "everyone looks at me like I'm taking graduate studies. No, I've only taken three courses in this, but this is what I've learned so far and I'd like to learn more about it. Now it's like I've started all over and they're saying, 'That's important, but here's what we're doing now' (laugh). I'm saying 'But isn't it all the same thing?'" (S2.8).

Tying and Untying (January to April, 1992)

Struggling with Voice

Susan's anger had mounted during the previous term and she was no longer able to hide her thoughts and questions. Feeling silenced made her more determined to speak up about issues she felt were important. She could not continue to "go with the flow." During this term, Susan struggled to voice her concerns about educational issues to others. At times she felt heard; at other times she felt silenced. Mostly, she felt alone -- isolated from others as she tried to construct a story of teaching which would connect with the narrative knowing she had not been encouraged to make explicit.

Episode #1: The Panel

As Education Week approached, Susan was excited about a discussion panel on the integration of special needs students into the regular school program. Susan imagined many contentious issues would be discussed during the session. The issue Susan was most concerned about was the need for Special Education training for all teachers. Susan was aware of how little she knew about teaching Special Education students even though this was her area of specialization. She was even more appalled by what she perceived to be the lack of awareness of special needs in the regular elementary eduction program. She felt integration of special needs students could not work effectively when teachers were not being trained adequately to deal with integration. She saw integration of special needs students as "a ludicrous proposition" (S8.17) with the present training teachers were getting. "It's pushing our profession, we're being pushed to our limits already and this could be the push that puts it right over the edge and then it'll be 'Back to the basics. These kids aren't learning anything'" (S8.17).

The panel was not what Susan had hoped. She felt many students were silenced when one of the panel members "introduced himself as doing a lot of the hiring for [a large school board] so everyone I think sort of thought, 'Well, if I say something that's inappropriate it won't look good for me.' Which it won't" (S9.1/2). However, integration was an important enough issue for Susan to speak up about. She was also tired, frustrated and angry at the way she had previously experienced important issues being "shoved under the carpet." Susan was no longer prepared to sit silently and let important issues and concerns be evaded. Susan addressed "three things in the panel" (S9.1). The first issue concerned the composition of the panel itself. "I had said I think it would have been better first of all if we would have had one more person on the panel or two more that were not so 'for' integration. The panel tended to really lead the discussion. You'd ask them a question and it would be like they would confer, which is fine, because who did you direct the question to first of all? But there was a lot of side-stepping happening. Like not answering the question, evading the question" (S9.1).

The second issue was the inadequate training of teachers, an issue "no one, with the exception of [one professor] had really mentioned" (S9.2). Susan voiced her concern that "you're going about this process in a backwards way" (S9.2). Susan knew "there's a lot of kids with needs not being met and teachers having a lot of problems" (S9.2). However, she went on to express her concern. "But I don't think the solution is to try and change it <u>there</u> and <u>then</u> change our training program. I think it should start <u>here</u>" (S9.2).

Susan was also concerned with being seen as an expert in Special Education when she felt her training was minimal in this area. "Basically they're telling us that they will be integrating Special Ed teachers into a regular classroom. . . . So I had just sort of said, 'Well, why are you relying on us as experts?'" (S9.2). Susan did not see her courses providing her with the expertise she felt she would be expected to have once she started teaching. "I'll have five courses in Special Ed and two at an introductory level. One on assessment which is irrelevant in how to teach children. They don't tell you what to teach. Or how to do it" (S9.2).

Susan's concern with inadequate training was closely tied to the third issue she raised. "One of the girls brought up the concern that she knew a secondary teacher who was saying, 'I don't want a special needs person in my classroom. I won't take one'" (S9.3). While Susan felt this was wrong because "you can't say I won't take one. You won't have a choice, you're under contract. You don't take one, you don't work. And you <u>won't</u> work if people find out that's what you're about" (S9.3). Responses such as "I find that shocking and disappointing" (S9.3) and "we have a constitution of rights and what that is is discrimination" (S9.3) from panel members made Susan furious as she

again heard a story that masked concern for the individual teachers involved. "I put up my hand and I said, 'Yes, of course we have a constitution of rights. Yes of course that would be discrimination. It is legislated. That doesn't get rid of the emotions involved. There is still fear.' And I said 'I think fear is very legitimate.' I said, 'And maybe the person didn't have the tact to say, 'I don't want this student in my classroom because I'm not adequately prepared to teach this child.' . . . You're on the defensive right away. And I said, 'I think that's a very important emotion involved in this whole thing. Fear of the unknown and fear of not knowing what you're doing'" (S9.3). Susan then pointed out how she felt this fear would work against integration in the classroom. "I said what type of integration will it be then? These emotions and these fears aren't going to just disappear. So this child gets integrated into this classroom. And will it be an environmental integration, taking up space? Or will it be social and academic? Probably not" (S9.4).

When Susan continued to voice her concerns in the following way, everyone applauded. "I don't see how you can invalidate that fear. And I said, 'Everyone seems so shocked when this girl ahead of me brought up this point.' I said, 'I've heard it at this university and not just once or twice. I hear it every day. Every day. So you're going to tell me that that's not a valid fear? Of course it's a valid fear and how are you going to deal with it? You can't just sweep it under the carpet" (S9.5). Susan concluded her remarks in the following way. "And what happens to us then when the public starts crying about this? Who falls? Not the government or their policy. The teachers because they're inadequate. Incompetent" (S9.5).

After the forum was over, Susan spent some time talking with panel members and others. The person who "did a lot of hiring" asked for Susan's name and wrote it down. He said he was really impressed with what she had said. Susan commented to me later, "It drives me crazy. Some of those people that I talked to at that panel were really nice people and they were caught in the system and they're saying, 'I respect that you could stand up and say what you said.' But I'm thinking, 'Why couldn't <u>you</u> stand up and say what I said?' And I have a lot more respect for people that can than people that won't. People that can and do and people that just won't. They say they can't, but it's not that you can't, it's that you won't and there's a difference" (S10.30).

Later, talking with other Special Education students, Susan began to figure out how the perceptions of others often determine who gets listened to. Susan was glad she had chosen Special Education as her focus area "because we'll have more voice because they will perceive us as experts. Not because we know more, but because the perception

is there" (S9.2). When I asked Susan if she could use that to her advantage, she replied, "It'll be used to my advantage definitely. It'll also be really tough" (S9.2).

Episode #2: We're Not on the Same Level

As Susan was beginning to be able to articulate new ideas and concerns about education, she was frustrated by her inability to make herself heard. When I mentioned "if you want to be heard, you've got to listen first and figure out where the other person is coming from," Susan replied, "And I'm still very, but this is how I want you to understand it so just listen to me for a minute please rather than listen to what you're saying and how I could maybe make you understand, or help you to understand where I'm coming from" (S11.36).

Susan was finding it more and more difficult to communicate her meaning to her friends who did not go to university. "I don't know what it is about university, whether it's the teaching that you get, the course content that you get or just the crap that you've got to go through and put up with that teaches you how to think or whatever, however it works. But I can tell you right now, if I sit in a group of my girlfriends from school and I sit in a group of my girlfriends that aren't in school, there's just no parallel whatsoever. We're not on the same level" (S11.35). Susan did not want to be set apart from her friends who were beginning to hear her as different from themselves. One friend had commented to Susan, "Sometimes I feel like it's so hard to talk to you because you know so much more than I do" (S11.35). Susan responded with "No, I don't know so much more. I've just been made to realize, come to realize what I do know and how I learn it therefore I can learn more. Whereas you haven't had that opportunity for experience that I have" (S11.35). Susan found it "super hard" (S11.35) to discuss things with her non-university friends including her fiance, Len, that were natural in conversations with her university friends. "But then you're at a real surface level of understanding and I feel like I'm deeper than that now and the people that I'm dealing with outside this place are still surface" (S11.35). Susan could foresee the same difficulty once she started teaching "with people that went to school ten years ago because most of the research that is supposed to be revolutionary or whatever is the past ten years. This is what they say anyways" (S11.35).

On one hand, Susan had trouble communicating her meaning with friends who had less education than she had. On the other hand, she was often not listened to by those who felt they had more education or experience than she had. She mentioned a teacher friend with whom she could not discuss educational issues. "I can't have a debate with her

because she has this status thing. She said to me, 'Well I've been doing this for 15 years and I don't think that there's anything that you can possibly tell me that I don't know.' And there's obviously nothing that I have to value in this conversation because you're not looking at me as an equal. You're looking at yourself as someone above my stature so, muddle away (laugh)" (S13.12/13).

Susan was having a great deal of difficulty translating the concepts she was learning in her courses and conversations at university into language others could understand. She could "go home and talk to Len about a million and one things but I cannot talk to him about [educational issues]" (S11.34). Susan went on to explain, "I can explain to him and then say what do you think and he'll tell me. But it's very draining to have to explain every time rather than just to 'Oh, well this is my perception of that.' Bang, bang" (S11.34).

Episode #3: Dinner With Friends

A conversation Susan had one weekend with friends made her aware of some of the issues she might need to deal with once she began teaching. The way others thought about education as well as their lack of understanding of Susan's views left Susan frustrated and angry. "I was boiling, that's what" (S11.27).

The group consisted of a variety of people with very diverse educational backgrounds. The conversation had turned to "thinking and dropping out of school. And I had said, 'Isn't it a tragedy that you go through 12 years of formal schooling and come out having no thinking skills'" (S11.27/28). Susan was appalled when one woman commented, "I don't know if I want my kids to think" (S11.29). We talked about how fear could be a powerful motivator for what people believe should and should not be taught. "You can question me now. Well let's hope so cause if they don't, you're god (laugh) and hopefully you realize that you're not. No, it drove me right up the wall and around the bend" (S11.31).

The ideas that made sense to Susan received little support from her friends. "They think it should be back to the basics. Reading and writing. The kids don't know how to read" (S11.28). She began to realize how strong their constructions (and convictions) were of what learning should be. "Well even talking to these people that didn't understand these new theories and the studies that have proven that kids learn when it's meaningful and it's relevant and all this. I mean it shouldn't take a study to prove that. It should be logic. But it seems that everyone is so programmed from their schooling that if I didn't read it somewhere and someone didn't tell me it's so, then it's not so. Like who are you to

tell me it's so? And especially if you're a woman who are you telling me it's so?" (S11.36).

One of the women "totally disagreed with me" (S11.28) as Susan emphasized learning needed to be relevant and meaningful for students. The woman was presently taking a university course herself. "I said 'Just tell me right now, I won't even tell you why I think you've learned it,' and she said, 'Because it was interesting.' Wow, what a concept. It's pretty logical. If it's interesting, you might learn it. You'd be interested and motivated. And 12 years of schooling couldn't do that for you? It's a travesty. It's a crying shame. And I said that I think the change coming in is good" (S11.28/29). As Susan expressed her views she was taken aback when one of the women present, a teacher, said. "'Oh your administrator's going to have a real problem with you, isn't he' (laugh). Well I said, 'First of all, he could definitely be a she' (laugh) and I said 'second of all, I don't think so because I think it's valuable what I'm talking about'" (S11.28).

Another woman in the group was a secondary teacher. Even here Susan received no support for her ideas. As she tried to explain the value of using a constructivist approach in her classroom, the woman could not imagine this approach working. Rather than supporting Susan in her views of trying to imagine a better education system for children, she saw Susan as "idealistic" (S11.29). Susan had heard this comment from others many times before and it really annoyed her. "I think you have to be or you're going to drown. I said I'm going to either be idealistic or throw my hands up in the air and say it won't make a difference anyways so who cares" (S11.29).

On the way home, Len tried to be supportive. He had said, "Don't let it bother you. They don't know what they're talking about and you do and hopefully when you get out there you'll be able to prove your point. Actions speak louder than words" (S11.31/32). However, Susan was not so sure that she would be able to have her point heard or understood. "But I said, 'It's a really scary thought then, to get out here and be told oh, you'll speak your mind when you get out there and be told to shut up (laugh)'" (S11.36).

Relating to Others

Susan still struggled with developing personal connections and being respected as a person in institutional settings which seemed to cover over personal needs. Individual persons seemed to be invisible and unheard of in the focus on theory, labels, curriculum, and policy. Objectifying knowledge seemed to objectify people as well.

Episode #1: Interacting With People

Susan felt one of the things that was desperately needed not only in education, but in society as a whole, was people being treated as people. "I think that if more people treated people like people you wouldn't have as many problems as you do. And I don't just mean in the school system. I mean everywhere" (S10.24). Susan was becoming more and more frustrated with encountering people who "didn't realize" (S10.24) how their words and actions affected others.

Susan felt it was crucial to see her students as people first. "But yet in school, we forget that. These are not people, they are Johnnie, my student" (S10.16). Susan felt that as a teacher, it would be essential to take time to think about each of her students as individuals.

Susan recalled from her own elementary school experience a student named Robert. She felt he had not been seen as Robert, but as "a behavior problem." "You think about a behavior problem and I know that there were a few in my classrooms that were behavior problems but they were treated as 'behavior problems,' not the fact that Robert had a different father every week, lived in a low rental, probably didn't eat more than twice a week, was allowed to go out and play which every kid thinks is great until they realize that everyone has to go in for supper and I have nowhere to go" (S10.16). However, the theories, categories, labels, and strategies Susan was learning in her program left little space for talking about people. "But I think that that's not talked about enough at this university either about the fact that it's not just a student. It's a person. He or she is a person and it's not just your curriculum guide and yes you have responsibilities in your job to carry out. But we seem to concentrate so much on that and we take the psychology stuff, but we never talk about, like I even think if we talked about this Robert and how you felt when he got sent down to the principal's office for the strap for the fifth time that week. First of all you're scared of the principal's office, but second of all, you thought to yourself and even at that age, what good is it doing?" (S10.17).

Susan also knew the students in her classroom would not exist in isolation. Not only would they bring their daily experiences from their home and community, they would bring memories of past school experience as well. Susan felt it was important "to understand where people are coming from" (S10.15). Susan also felt it was important to consider where her students might be going in the future. This led her to consider the importance of working together as a team with other teachers in the school. "I think there needs to be a bit more team stuff because the student does not live a year. He still has to

go through the system and that's what happened even with [my brother]. He got an excellent teacher one year and after that it was a write off until Grade 7" (S10.23).

Susan had been talking to Zach about his practicum evaluations. She felt the evaluation really emphasized his abilities without recognizing the relationships developed between Zach and his students in the classroom. "The real main idea I got from the whole thing was you established the rapport, you did this, you are good at this, you did that. I said well doesn't it stand to reason that the best way to evaluate your teaching would be to look at the students rather than, like you as well as the students. But rather than focusing on you, isn't there more to it than just you, or were you alone (laugh) in that class?" (S13.11).

Since Susan felt mutual respect would be an important component in her classroom, she felt she would not be able to tolerate defiance from her students. "I don't think that it would be acceptable to me because number one, this is our classroom and you are hampering the ability of everyone else in this room to do what they want to do. Number two, and I mean this sounds probably really bad, but I am an authority figure and it's not right for you to be defying me because otherwise how do you ever learn that there are times that you have to do what you're told? And I'm not saying that's what school should be about, but it's part of it. And I think it's important. It's part of respect for other people, not just for authorities, but for other people" (S10.14).

Susan found few examples of respect at university. Part of the problem seemed to be that everyone seemed to have something to say but no one had time to listen. "We were sitting with Bill [another student] and I said, 'Do you want to hear this or not?' And he says 'Oh, I'm sorry.' I said, 'Well you do it all the time and you talk and you don't even notice that an hour ago I quit listening to you' (laugh)" (S11.9).

Susan also found those with more status assumed they could have the floor and did not need to listen to those with less status. "It drives me nuts. I'll give you an example. Today I was in this meeting and twice, I was asked something and I went to start talking. [Two other students who were members of the executive] were standing at the front table which sort of ticked me anyway and we were all sitting around them. I don't like that you know. I don't like having someone stand while I sit or someone sit while I stand. It makes me, it's just this stratification thing. Status. And every time I started talking, I got to practice my teacher effectiveness skills today. They started 'psspssppssp.' So I stopped. And I looked over at both of them and they both quickly, 'Oh, I'm sorry.' I said 'Oh that's ok. I just sort of thought since you asked me, you wanted to hear about it.'" (S11.8).

Susan felt others were beginning to think of her as "a B-I-T-C-H with capital letters" (S11.8). However, Susan was at the point of not being able to take much more. "I'm just fed up with no respect in classes, no respect toward profs, no respect anywhere. It wears you. It wears you thin. That's what I find. I get really stressed. I start feeling really bad when I feel like people don't show me any respect" (S11.8).

"Little things" (S11.9) did not seem to be valued, "like going and doing something for someone and not hearing a thank you or a please or just very basic fundamental respectful things. Consideration maybe is a better word. I think they go hand in hand. If you're considerate, you're usually respectful toward people" (S11.9).

Susan also felt respect was what developed between people. It was shown in actions. She became annoyed when titles seemed to be respected more than people. The issue came up during a discussion of playground behavior. "Like everyone else was blowing off a bunch of hot air, unless you're calling so and so 'Mrs.', you don't respect them. If you call me Mrs Jones, and turn around and do something exactly that you know you're not supposed to be doing, then that is not respect and you can call me whoever you want to. What is in a name? It's a name. I respect people more when they're not looking down on me and saying, 'I'm Dr. so and so.' Oh, well la de dah (laugh)" (S11.14).

Episode #2: Visiting the Behavior Assistance Class

One of the assignments Susan was really looking forward to was a visit to a school to observe a Special Education classroom and a regular classroom. After visiting the two classrooms Susan was to write a paper comparing the two. However, when Susan arrived at the school, arrangements had not been made to visit a regular classroom. "We were supposed to compare the two and now we're just going to be commenting on what we saw" (S12.12).

Susan was pleased the Special Education classroom she would be visiting was a Behavior Assistance classroom. This was a special class for children with behavioral difficulties. Two of the "real challenging" students were absent because of an incident that had occurred in the classroom two days before her visit. In some ways Susan was disappointed these two children were absent. "The real real real challenging ones weren't there which was kind of . . . I said call me sadistic but I wanted to see a restrain, I wanted to see a real real big outburst and see how she dealt with it. That's what I wanted to see, but. . ." (S12.11).

The experience of being in a classroom allowed Susan to see some of the discipline and teaching models she had learned about in her university classes. "I saw everything. I saw a lot of the models in that class, like into practice that we're doing here. What I saw in

that classroom I'll remember for a long time" (S12.13). The visit also made Susan aware of the emotional impact of teaching. "Like my first reaction was an emotional one. I felt sad. I felt like I was going to start crying just seeing these kids . . . just the initial reaction. And then she was talking about the backgrounds of these kids and you know it was an emotional thing at first, but then I just, well this is it (laugh)" (S12.13).

The teacher's comment also validated Susan's belief in the need for practical experience. "She said, 'Nothing you are taking can prepare you for your first year.' She said, It's going to be hell on earth' (laugh). She said, 'I'm not trying to scare you,' she said, 'That's facts'" (S12.10).

Susan enjoyed the way the day started off and was able to identify the techniques being used. "I started off the day with group discussion which is a Glasser technique and they had an agenda and started out with a compliment around the circle" (S12.5). However, it was the human aspect Susan focused on. "These compliments were so genuine. It was so nice to see and she said, 'I like to start off that way because it calms them down and it helps them feel good about themselves'" (S12.5).

Susan soon noticed how individual children could get left behind as the discussion progressed. "It was just a real nice way to start out the day. And then one little kid didn't have one [a compliment] and she said, 'Would you like me to come back to you?' and he said, 'Yeah,' but she didn't go back to him which he didn't like. She forgot, but the aide was sitting there too and I think that, I felt like speaking up but I knew that, I've only been here 20 minutes (laugh), I better keep my mouth shut. But he was upset about that, you could see him. He had his hand up like "me me" and she went on with the routine" (S12.6).

Susan also enjoyed the "morning message" activity which all the students participated in. "It was letters left out so they had to use phonetics and contextual information to figure out the lesson. Then they had to copy the message into their book and read it over. . . . The older, well, higher functioning kids then went on to writing" (S12.11).

Again Susan found a tension between the curriculum activity planned by the teacher and the way this activity was experienced by one of the students. She was drawn to Ben, a little boy with big blue eyes, an endearing manner, and a very low frustration point. As others were copying the morning message, Ben was having trouble. "Ben had asked me if I would help him with his writing from the morning message, if I'd read it with him, so, I helped him read it" (S12.20). As Susan read through the message with Ben, "you could just see him though getting frustrated. 'Why can't I do this?' and I just put my hand on his shoulder and I said, 'Just relax.' I said, 'You're doing great' and he was. And I said,

'Put your pencil down and let's look at the board' and, it was stupid. He was sitting with his back to the board. I said, 'Why don't we move around here so we can see it and I think that will help both of us'" (S12.20). Ben relaxed and was able to finish the morning message when Susan took the time to provide encouragement and guidance. Working individually with Ben helped him work through his frustrations. Susan was able to give him the support he needed to continue on with what for him was a difficult task. "But you see there was no attention to that. It was let's finish it and let's move on. But to me you're not improving if you're not concentrating, if you're worried about keeping up, if you're worried about getting on so you can do the next thing which was them all writing out a story together" (S12.20).

As Susan worked with Ben, she began to realize she did know something about relating to students. "It was like, it came to me automatically, I was like Woah, I do know some of this now" (S 12.6).

Susan felt a tension between the lack of emphasis placed on academic skills as much of the teacher's time was spent enforcing rigid behavioral controls. "It was very lacking in the academic skill area and I know that it's easy to criticize from a distance but I really didn't see much academics going on at all" (S12.10). Susan found the behaviors often became the primary focus when she felt they "should just be a given, an underlying thing" (S12.11). Susan was aware of the conflicting stresses and tensions the teacher was experiencing and felt she was often too overwhelmed by immediate concerns to take time to think carefully about what she was doing. "I can see where you just get to the point where I don't give a hoot what these kids are doing as long as they are conforming to the rules, behaving" (S12.23).

Susan described the children as needing "so much individual attention" (S12.8). This seemed to be controlled by several rules for behavior which "had been formulated by all of them together" (S12.12). Much of the curriculum seemed to be organized around goals, rewards, and penalties. At times Susan felt the goals and thus the rewards were out of reach for the children. However, Susan could understand how decision making became easier in a very difficult classroom when the teacher dealt with misbehaviors in a consistent manner.

Susan found the "time out room" very puzzling. She explained how the students had been "trained" to use this room in the Fall and was curious to see how this training took place. "And then they did have the time out room and it was all carpeted. That was sort of weird to see. She used it probably five times when I was there and it was, like you can tell that a lot of the training itself has happened. That's why I'll be glad when I see it in September" (S12.6).

Although the students were supposedly trained to know why they were being sent to the time out room, when Susan questioned one of the students, she seemed to have little idea of the purpose of the time out room. "I said, 'I want to know what Miss. R says you should do' and she couldn't tell me" (S12.23/24). This bothered Susan. "To me it would be thinking about how to behave better next time. Thinking about what I did to get me there. Thinking about how I can stay out of here and it just wasn't there" (S12.23). When Susan questioned the teacher about this, she was told, "Well we did that at the beginning" (S12.23).

Susan had an uneasy sense that the "training" was not educating the children to think about and take responsibility for their own behaviors. "It becomes automatic to them. And what happens when you get into the real world and you don't have a time out room? How do you deal with it then?" (S12.24). Susan felt it would have been beneficial to spend time discussing the children's behaviors with them to help them understand how to control their own behavior.

Susan felt the children's home backgrounds had a profound effect on what could be accomplished at school. "I thought about it a lot after I got home. Actually I thought about it a lot when I was there too. I said, 'Do you feel that the work that you do here gets undone when they go home?' I mean three of the students that were there, the mother is a prostitute, one, the father was a pimp and then also you have to think about the substance abuse that goes along with those life styles" (S12.8/9). Both Susan and the teacher felt the parents' rights were protected while the children's were not. "I said, 'Doesn't it bother you?' She says, 'Every day.' She says that this system is not working and I said, 'Do you get angry that it's protecting the wrong people?' And she says, 'Absolutely'" (S12.17).

Shifts in Knowing

During this second term, Susan struggled with trying to make connections between what she valued as a student and what she felt she was expected to do as a teacher. As a student, Susan valued having time to explore the process of coming to know in her own way, appreciated having choices and having her ideas acknowledged. While she wanted to provide this for her students, she was also learning to tell a teaching story of clear objectives, and well planned lessons. Susan could not imagine how she could evaluate what her students had learned if she was not clear about what she expected them to know. While Susan wanted her students to construct their own knowing, she worried about her responsibilities as a teacher to keep her students focused and to cover the required curriculum.

Episode #1: Art Lessons

Susan left her first Art class frustrated and angry. The lesson was on perspective and Susan was to draw a house following the steps as her professor explained them. What started out as an interesting lesson soon turned into a disaster as Susan struggled to keep up, couldn't, and lost interest. While the rest of the class moved on to doors, windows, chimney, fence, and trees, Susan was still struggling with the basement. Even when Tom, an experienced artist and Art teacher, took time to help her with using perspective in drawing, this could not rekindle the initial excitement she had taken to her first class.

Susan seldom talked about Art again and it did not come up in our research conversations until late in the term when her portfolio was due. Susan told me "It's due next Thursday. I haven't even gotten my materials yet" (S13.1). Susan's experience in her first class had shaped her attitude toward the whole course. When I commented, "But you didn't go in like that," Susan replied, "No! I went in thinking this is going to be really fun. Even after Tom showed me, I didn't want to pick it up again because I remember what I felt like. I felt like an idiot. I don't need that. So, I've whipped out my portfolio stuff, looked at this, looked at that. I don't need it. And I know that once I start this thing, I will want every piece that I make to be absolutely perfect and that's why I haven't started" (S13.8).

Susan felt that in her own classroom she would want to emphasize the process in order to help her students create the product they imagined. "The process to me is more important than the product but I want the kids to be able to visualize the product in the end and if it doesn't turn out exactly how they visualized it, well they want to be able to deal with that and not be so angry that it doesn't look exactly like they thought" (S13.7). Susan imagined the process to be "a step towards a product and if you get discouraged too quickly then you don't care about the product and you don't enjoy the process" (S13.8). I wondered if this connected with Susan's experience in her first Art class where, I commented, "you had to get it done right away, and you didn't have time to explore that process." Susan agreed. She had not had time to explore the process "at all. And I haven't picked it up since. Isn't that terrible? What an attitude" (S13.8).

Susan wanted to be able to provide her students with the techniques she had missed in her own schooling. "I think that there is some real skills that are being taught now in Art that I never had and I wish I would have" (S13.6). Susan was frustrated that she was not getting the time to explore and practice these techniques in her present course.

When Susan and her partner needed to develop a unit plan for Art and present it to the class, they decided to develop a unit on masks. Susan had little trouble designing the unit, but again the format of the assignment created difficulties. "It's not hard at all. The

thing that's difficult is [the required format]" (S13.2). However, she decided to construct the unit in a way that made sense to her and then explain her rationale. Susan went on to describe how she imagined the lesson proceeding. "We talked about a short conference with the child. Nonintrusive questioning just to help the child become aware of his conscious choices and the alternative choices that would be available to him and why his choice was the best one to what he wanted to portray. It's all subjective but it gets him to at least start thinking about why did you choose yellow for his face?" (S13.2).

When I mentioned I could see a connection between the way Susan had constructed the Art unit and her valuing of "critical thinking and kids being able to make choices and know why," she replied, "Exactly. Well that was our whole rationale behind each choice that the student made" (S13.2).

The way Susan described planning the mask unit made so much sense to me. I was surprised when she described this type of planning as "backwards." "Art to me is a backward subject because to me, figure out what you're going to do first, and then relate it to the curriculum. I picked out some real general broad objectives and what would this unit accomplish and within that I went through the progression. Plus mine was making something so we ended it with a skit from a Language Arts story using the masks and then without the mask to show the difference in the interpretation and so that goes back to expression. But I said that it worked backwards for me because if I would have done all of these objectives then it limits you so much" (S13.3).

Susan had often expressed concern with her inability to integrate, and yet this seemed to me to be exactly what she was doing. I agreed that selecting objectives first would prevent her from developing a unified plan, something I had been stressing to the students I was teaching in a course on Curriculum Development. Susan agreed. "It's limiting to one, yeah, and nothing is isolated in the real world so it made more sense for me to go back and look at my general objectives and see if this lesson fell underneath it. And then go to my specific objectives from the curriculum guide, but after I had done all my planning. It was totally backwards" (S13.3). I could not understand why Susan kept referring to this kind of planning as backwards. When I said, "But I don't think it's backwards," Susan replied, "But backwards from what we've been taught" (S13.4).

I was surprised at Susan's comment as I thought back to the previous term. I said, "I'm thinking back to last fall when you were saying everything was a bowl of soup, like everything was all messed up together and you couldn't make sense of anything and it seems to me now what you want to do with the Art is make it a bowl of soup." Susan explained "Yeah. But I think that's also because I did try it the first way. The way I'd been taught and it didn't make sense to me and I could not visualize myself teaching it this

way because to me then a lot of the enjoyment would be lost if your whole lesson's going to be on reflection" (S13.4).

Susan had also incorporated questioning into the lesson in a way she imagined would help her students think carefully about the individual choices they had made. "Within each lesson the kid was doing something and then I related it back again to why did you do it this way? Ok, composition. Did you know that the texture of your mask is going to affect the message that it's sending and why do you put the texture in and why don't you" (S13.4).

Susan imagined evaluation in Art very differently from evaluation in other subject areas. Susan could imagine evaluating herself and the lesson she had designed. "I don't like to use the word evaluation in Art. Unless it's for me. Evaluation of my lesson. How well did it go? What went well, what didn't? Why did it, why did it not?" (S13.5). Susan could also imagine evaluating whether or not her students had grasped the concept she was trying to help them understand. However, she would not feel comfortable evaluating how students chose to express themselves using the concept. "If you did a lesson on symmetry then the way to evaluate it would be to choose things that are symmetrical and things that are asymmetrical. But as far as evaluating their piece of art, unless I said I want something symmetrical then I don't feel right evaluating it. If you put your time into it and you're happy with it I'm happy with it" (S13.6).

Susan saw her teaching role as "giving you the moral support that you need to allow you to continue. . . . And to help you deal with the failure that you have just experienced. That's life" (S13.7).

Episode #2: Knowing What to Expect

In order to feel comfortable and confident, it was important for Susan to be prepared and being prepared involved knowing what to expect so she could plan. However, Susan's university experience was not at all what she expected. "It looks like a pretty easy job (laugh). And then you start finding out. Oh, but there's more behind this than you see" (S8.9). The more Susan saw, the more overwhelmed she became. As she began to realize what would be expected of her as a teacher, her sense of inadequacy increased. "I find these last two years so overwhelming. I'm getting great marks. I'm getting better marks than I had expected but I don't think that I'm having the process time. It's just wht in, wht out, wht in. And you retain a few things. And then when you get out there again I think you're going to have the same process of being overwhelmed, looking at other teachers and what they're doing and thinking, 'Boy, am I inadequate'" (S8.9/10).

Susan was angry she had not been informed sooner about how much there was to know about teaching. "If I had known in my first year, I would have been more inclined to pick up some information, because at that time I had no idea what I didn't know. I've gone through school. I've sat in front of the teacher for 12 years. How hard can it be? (laugh)" (S8.9). Once Susan became aware of how much there was to know about teaching, she wondered, "why wait until your last year and a half to cram all of this instruction into it?" (S8.9). Feeling she needed to know what to do before she actually started teaching was a continual tension for Susan.

Susan felt her professors were assuming she already had clear concepts in areas where she felt she had minimal experience. "Like [one professor] said, you've all got lesson planning and unit planning. Well no, I've never done a unit plan. I did one in an hour in a classroom. Well that's not a unit plan. It's throwing ideas together. It would never work in the real world you know. You wouldn't put together a unit in an hour I hope (laugh). So, I'm saying well no, not really. I missed that course somewhere (laugh)" (S8.13).

Susan also found each professor had different expectations and she needed to figure out each one individually. "I found that every class has sort of expected that you've taken it somewhere but every professor has a different idea of what his expectations for a lesson plan are. And I can't find that out from another class. I have to find it out from him" (S8.3). However, Susan felt, since each professor seemed to have different expectations about what lesson planning was, "it would almost be better for them to show you all these styles. And then you can look at that professor and evaluate his teaching, if it worked for you. If this lesson plan makes sense to you, would you use it? Then you have a repertoire of skills at least rather than is there one right way to do it" (S8.3).

Susan was beginning to believe a lesson plan "has essential ingredients, but how you put them together, I mean it's just like putting together a cake. You might have flour and sugar and all that, but if you put the wrong proportions in, you won't have a cake. You'll have a slop (laugh)" (S8.3). She wanted time to think about how to put the "essential ingredients" together in creative ways that could work for her. However, each class was an isolated fragment. "Well, I'm trying to think of more creative ways, but, Oop, class is over (laugh). On to the next one. And then it's different again" (S8.12). Each course had its own separate agenda, expectations, and assignments. Near the end of the term, Susan "had 11 assignments and [was] going nuts" (S13.1).

However, one thing that seemed to be a common message from all Susan's courses was that as a teacher she would be expected to have a clear idea of where she was going. Lessons were to be planned, taught, and evaluated. "And that was like with those scripted

lesson plans that I was doing. And a lot of the books, the literature I am reading is saying you should have a mental script. Ok, so I can understand why you would want that because at the end, if you didn't have any idea of what answers you were expecting you wouldn't know what you'd taught and the kids wouldn't really know what they learned" (S8.7). Susan could not imagine evaluating her teaching or her students' progress unless she had specific expectations in mind ahead of time. "Unless you had a clear expectation in your mind, I don't see how you could reflect back and see if it was successful or not" (S8.4).

Susan had also learned in her courses that it was important to have an objective. However, in each course, objectives were defined differently. "[In one class] it was very specific behavioral objectives. Then I went to another class and they don't want a specific, this should be able to go to any lesson. They want, basically, a goal. Or an aim. Not an objective, an objective to me should be very specific" (S8.3). When I asked, "Where do you get that from? Is it from here or did you come in believing an objective was specific?" Susan replied, "I got it from here. I'm sure I did. But I've also looked at lesson plans that don't have a specific objective and I think 'Good luck teaching that one,' because you're not going to know at the end where you were going and did you get there" (S8.4). When I asked, "And is that important?", Susan's reply made me think she believed it was her job as a teacher to keep her students on a predetermined learning track. "I think that if you're going to make the lesson meaningful to your students, well you'd better have it clear in your head, from the onstart, that this is what you want them to learn. If it goes a different direction, then you'll be able to understand why it went that way. If you didn't have any expectation or understanding in the first place then it's just another hour that you've filled" (S8.4).

We discussed how teaching students a unit on water in science might develop. Susan struggled with the tension of meeting the interests and needs of individual students while at the same time keeping a focused lesson. "I'll ask these questions to find out what they know if anything about water and then by that way you're building on their knowledge, inputting your knowledge, combining your efforts, and hopefully at the end you've learned something about water, you know" (S8.5). Susan worried that if she allowed students to express their individual interests, "you would have a lesson then going 52 directions" (S8.6).

However, Susan could "see so many contradictions" (S8.7). She knew if she had specific goals for the lesson "then I have a hidden agenda to my lesson, right. I'm asking this question and the kids who catch on to my style of teaching are going to go 'oh, she wants this answer'" (S8.7). This was "going on the other side of what I've read to say if

you are expecting an answer then your kids will catch on very quickly how to please you, not how to learn. How to please you with their responses" (S8.7).

Susan was not able to resolve the tension between constricting her students' learning with a preplanned lesson which would provide her with a sense of certainty in what she would expect to happen, and allowing the students to explore their interests which would lead Susan to a sense of uncertainty because she would not know what to expect. "I know what I would like my class to be like but I don't know if I'll have the skill to get in there and do it this way without having it go 50 directions and then turn around at the end of the day and say, "If I'm going to keep a job (laugh) and I'm going to keep my sanity, I better get some organization happening here because now I have 50 other potential lessons and where do I go?'" (S8.7/8).

Susan felt there was a big gap between what she would be expected to accomplish as a teacher and the way she was being trained to meet those expectations. "I think it'll be a hard reality when you get teaching. You're going to say Yeah, I see that I'm missing a lot of these skills here and I'm not sure if I have enough time in every day to make each lesson go how I would like it to include every student and to give a variety of styles for, you know, each student to learn" (S8.8).

Episode #3: Putting Theory Into Practice

Susan continued to be frustrated by the lack of opportunity to connect the conceptual descriptions she was receiving with her narrative knowing. She knew there was a difference between knowing something in theory and knowing how to apply it in practice. "Well I seem to be chomping at the bit to at least get into a school and figure out, 'Ha, I don't know close to what I thought I knew,' or 'Gee, I know a lot more than I ever thought I did.' But I won't find that out until it's the end" (S8.12). Susan was tired of "practicing in theory." "I'm finding a lot of repetition of stuff that I've taken. Oh yeah. So I feel real confident. Oh yeah, I know that answer. But why repeat it? If I've learned it, I've learned it. Why am I going to practice it to death in theory? Why don't I practice it in practice? This is redundant and it's silly" (S8.14).

Susan desperately wanted to put the theories into practice in order to make the information she had acquired personally meaningful. "I understand the theory. I got an eight in that course so can we get into something else, please" (S8.15). When I asked, "The something else being the practice?", Susan replied, "Sure (laugh). How about that. Real kids" (S8.15).

As the term progressed, the theories were becoming more and more redundant yet still remained irrelevant when Susan had no narrative knowing of teaching to connect them to. "I'm falling asleep already. I just want to teach. I've had these conversations 50 thousand times. I'm not hearing them anymore. I don't care about them anymore. I do, but I don't want to sit in this class and hear about it. And then they say we don't have the time to get you out to a school. Well if I could tell you how many things I've done repetitiously in the past four years, it would add up to probably two years of teaching" (S11.10).

Susan saw herself as having developed a critical stance toward watching others teach. As Susan watched videos of "teachers teaching" (S8.12), she believed she was "at the critical part where I can look at, no, no, no. He would have supplied you with the answer if you would have given him five more seconds. Why didn't you wait? You just robbed him of that opportunity and now he feels dumb, so will he answer your question again? Or I can look and think Gee, what a boring way to introduce that lesson. I'm asleep. How can these kids even be awake and they're sitting for an hour" (S8.12). However Susan knew it would be very different once she was actually teaching. She described herself as an "armchair critic, backseat driver. Put me into the driver seat and see how quickly it changes" (S8.12).

While Susan could comment on things that did not go well, she had little idea how to create positive learning environments. She felt she lacked both the opportunity and the confidence to explore alternative possibilities. "I mean you have to have some personal opinion on it. Am I going to use this? Will I use it? Do I think it's valuable? But why can't it at least be brought up and 'taught' if you want to call it, lectures, whatever. No, we're just going to leave that up to you but we say that the rationale for the constructivist approach to learning Science is the best one. You're not showing me <u>how</u> though. I agree with you and I've agreed with you for the past two years and then I'm going to get out there and think I don't know what I'm doing, I'm going back to the textbook and the worksheet thank you" (S11.19).

Episode #4: Learning to Think

As Susan thought about her own public schooling experience, she realized that while she did well and got good marks, she had not learned to think for herself. During elementary school "I was always at the top of the class. 'We should accelerate Susan, she's doing so well.' You know what I missed out on? Thinking. I was great at doing exactly what the teacher wanted. I was great at conforming to the way society thinks

people should be treated. Super. But thinking? No" (S10.19). High school was a similar story where Susan "still did fine because a lot of it didn't require higher thought processes" (S10.19). However, university had been a surprise. "My first year of university, I got a question like 'what is your perspective, evaluate these two writers and what is your perspective on what they're trying to say?' I just said what they said, 'What more do you want?' And then all of a sudden I'm thinking I'm stupid. And it's not even that I'm stupid, it's the fact that really, I think in a lot of ways, the education system failed me" (S10.19). Susan felt "university teaches you to think which is a crime because shouldn't you have learned that through 12 years of school? And the knowledge that you picked up and all the facts that you memorized, but you don't remember now anyway was a real waste of time because we could have taught you how to find out the resources, how to look through them, how to think about it, how to apply a strategy that would help you and then you should be competent in pretty well any setting" (S10.19).

Susan valued having time to think but was often disappointed in the time allowed for thinking about learning within her classes. "And I think a lot of times too though when I have come across some course that I really connected with they helped me to think . . . and I haven't come across a lot of profs that seem to value that. They automatically think you should know how to do that. Well you're not being a teacher then are you. You're transmitting all this. And what is your job and what are you supposed to be training me to do?" (S10.20).

Susan also found when students were encouraged to be reflective, "nobody went past the surface meaning of the question which I thought at this level they would" (S12.3). When I asked Susan what she meant by being reflective, she described reflection in the following way. "Thinking about why and what and other ways and the rationale behind, like the why we do it, and the rationale behind the why" (S11.6).

Susan imagined training and education to be the same thing. "Like now they're training us to teach with an integrated subject approach versus trying to train you to teach Math, Science, so I think of that as training, or education. It's the same thing. I mean them as the same" (S10.2). She expected to be presented with "general rules and procedures" (S10.2).

Susan also wanted time to think about what the theories might mean to her. Susan was finding her courses "really difficult. I can go through all these activities and not even think about them. Which is what everyone in our group seems to do. Quick get it done and talk about whatever. But I said, 'What do you think would be learned by this activity?', then I start thinking, well if I couldn't explain what I think they're going to learn, then what would be the point? Wouldn't they just be doing a worksheet? Here's

worksheet number two. Here's worksheet number three. Oh, you're done? Do some more (laugh)" (S10.4).

However, Susan felt "there doesn't seem to be enough thinking going on in a lot of what I'm doing" (S11.15). When Susan commented in class that diagnostic labelling could lead to "pigeon holing people, or having the students pigeon hole themselves, 'I always get Ds and that's all I can get'" (S11.15), Susan felt others thought her idea "was so strange that everyone was so ohhh, what a far out idea. Like people, you're going to be teaching. You should be thinking. If you want to teach thinking, you better be able to do it yourself" (S11.15).

Susan made a distinction between memorization and thinking. "And to me, the fact is not as important as being able to figure out the fact so if I'm able to memorize ten things, that's not as important as being given ten new things now and putting some rhyme and reason to them. That's thinking. That's not memorization and it's not transmission of knowledge" (S13.20).

Susan saw memorization as an ineffective learning strategy. While Susan felt she could "cram a lot in there and spit it out when the time comes" (S13.17), this strategy did not help her feel she had learned much. While Susan wanted to be exposed to and have time to think about other strategies, what she felt she had was a list of meaningless facts. She did not want this to be the way she learned how to teach. "If your only strategy is memorizing then you're exhausting a lot of your energy there whereas you could have used a better strategy which would make it easier to learn and construct for yourself what you learned" (S13.18).

Episode #5: I'm Learning!

Susan knew from her own experience that she needed time to "play around with something" before she could feel she had learned something about it. "I think that that happens every time you learn something" (S10.7). Having this experience in Science class left Susan feeling validated as a learner. Susan had decided to take a Science curriculum course this term since she felt incapable of teaching Science. In her Science curriculum course she was finally able to experience a kind of learning that made sense to her. Early in the course Susan found her professor open to questions and able to respond from a practical as well as a theoretical point of view. "My professor gave us our stuff and sort of made it like a game. The object of the game is to get the light bulb to light. And once you've gotten it, find as many ways as you can to get the light bulb to light" (S10.7). In this class, Susan was able to make connections between her narrative knowing from

previous experience and the task the professor had set. "I asked about an open and a closed circuit, like I was thinking electrician things. I said, 'But what about a switch?' So my professor brought us a switch! And I'm thinking, 'What a good teacher!', you know. Not 'well we'll do switches, well it'll probably work like this.' The professor said, 'I'll see if I have one, I'll try and find one for you'" (S10.7). By being encouraged to test out her own ideas, Susan felt "like 'I'm learning! I'm learning!' Not just that I made it right because I was told why it lit. We had to find out on our own why we thought it lit" (S10.7). Susan could begin to imagine this kind of learning happening in her own classroom. "I thought with kids, what an excellent way to do it because you'd obviously be curious" (S10.8). Susan described this type of lesson as "training because we went through it ourselves" (S10.8).

Susan appreciated the way her professor recognized her as someone whose ideas were worthy of pursuing by asking "an open ended question. I hated Science because I always felt stupid. I could never do it the right way. I felt really smart at the end of that class because I had come up with the switch, and it worked" (S10.8).

Susan felt the approach in this class really opened up her own learning. "You don't ever really have a closure in that class and I like that. We have a closure in the fact that we call it linking. So you're linking up your knowledge and trying to make it understandable to yourself with the help of your teacher if you need it and maybe you don't. Or with the help of your students, your peers" (S10.8/9). The kinds of "closure" Susan experienced in this class allowed her to make connections between what she felt she had learned and what she would still like to know. "It's not 'Ok that's it for electricity and tomorrow we're going to do meal worms,' which is what my other class was exactly. . . . Instead of inviting them to be creative you're shutting the door in their faces and saying 'It's done, it's over and that's the end.' And you got the right answer, pat yourself on the back" (S10.9). This course provided a sense of accomplishment and future direction for Susan.

Susan later talked about the constructivist approach as one of play, replay, and debrief. She described "play" as "just what it sounds like, working with what you're given, going every different way, discovering things, losing it, rediscovering it, losing it, discovering. . ." (S13.18). When I asked Susan if there was any connection between this approach and her teacher education program as a whole, she replied that her program had been "mostly play (laugh). Mostly play and then jumping right to the debrief. What did you get out of this?" (S13.19).

When I commented on how confused and frustrated Susan had been, and still was at times, she replied "mhm. Because it went on too long. I was ready to continue and I

was ready for the next step. I've got my shoes tied, now let's go. No, untie them and tie them again, untie them and tie them again (laugh). No. I tied them for a reason and now I want to go. So where can I go? Where will you let me go? And I don't see a lot of 'going' going on (laugh)" (S13.19).

Susan also imagined this could be a problem with children in elementary classrooms. "If your science program just becomes messing about then people are really valid in saying this inquiry approach is crap because that is what it is. It turns into group work, it turns into play. To me, in school, play should have a bit of a purpose" (S13.19). However, Susan imagined that, done properly, this approach would provide a powerful way for students to learn and continue learning.

Susan could see connections between this approach to Science and language learning. "This language program, philosophy, goes right into Science and now you play and you did your replay, so I want you to write what you did and some kids will never in that year get above a level of being able to say first I poured the water into the cup. Then I added the color. Then this happened. But that will come. I think that it's developmental. . . . Try and challenge them in a different way then. If you've written how you did it. But what does that mean? But that goes into whole language, language learning again. That's writing and it's for a different purpose and it's reading and it's spelling and it's grammar and it's punctuation" (S13.21).

Susan not only "really enjoy[ed] the class. I got a lot out of that class and I'm not scared of teaching Science anymore and I was petrified before" (S13.25). She could now see Science as a starting point to build the rest of her curriculum around. "I can see it being really valuable. Like I can see Science being, rather than some subject that you only teach because it's in the curriculum, I can see it as being a real strong point to build a lot of your other subject areas around. Science and then into Phys Ed and then into Art and into Language and then into Math. I can see this being a real strong subject for that" (S13.26). However, while Susan could imagine using a constructivist approach to build a curriculum for her students and to enable them to inquire into and make connections in their own learning, she did not seem to see this approach as a way to inquire into her own teaching.

Off and Running (September to December, 1992)

When Susan and I met during July, she was feeling "utterly and totally cheated by the system that they have" (S14.12) at the university. She was angry at the way her

university experience had been decontextualized from the practice for which she felt she was being trained. Susan needed her own narrative experience to provide contextualized memories. "If I would have been able to do it and put it into practice it would be a memory to me. Now its not a memory, it's a page on a book. Its print on a page in a book and that's all it is -- dead" (S14.9/10). Susan wished she "could have at least had someone coaching me through all this theory, thinking, you know, because it did feel like a lot of the things I was reading were good. But there was something missing" (S14.17).

Susan was also disappointed that she did not "feel educated." "I thought I would really value my degree and I know that I won't. It's just a piece of paper and it really doesn't mean anything and I had thought it would mean a lot because it would mean that I was educated and I don't feel educated" (S14.13). When I asked Susan what she thought it would feel like to be educated, she replied, "Confident. I would feel more confident anyway. I wouldn't feel like I knew everything, but I would feel like I knew something. A place to start anyways and I don't feel like I know much. I don't feel like I learned a lot about the dynamics supposedly of teaching. I don't feel I learned a lot about the dynamics in the classroom or a school. I don't feel like I learned a lot about kids. If I'm going to be teaching, shouldn't I know everything there is to know about a kid?" (S14.13).

During this term Susan would finally experience the practicum she had craved throughout the previous year. However, she would have "no idea until September 4th" (S14.2) where she would be placed and "the apprehension is terrible" (S14.2). When Susan finally found out her practicum placement, she was pleased. She had been placed in an elementary school in an older residential area of the city where she attended university. Approximately 300 students from Kindergarten to Grade 6 attended this school. There was high parent involvement with the students and teachers. The school also had a Special Education Behavior Assistance classroom to which students from various areas outside the community were bussed daily. Susan was pleased with the diversity available to her within this one school.

Authoring: Who Will be Listened to?

As Susan tried to author classroom stories which reflected her values of teaching and learning, she found herself accountable to a variety of others who valued different stories of teaching and learning.

Episode #1: Caught in the Middle of Multiple Stories

Being both a student of teaching and a teacher of students simultaneously left Susan feeling "caught in the middle" (S17.7). While she enjoyed working with children,

appreciated the variety of experiences she was exposed to in her practicum placement, and felt her cooperating teachers were "excellent," she hated her position as "a student teacher. I hate it. I hate feeling like I'm stepping on someone's toes because I am not 'the' teacher and I hate being given all the responsibility with nothing to fall back on" (S19.7).

Susan's 14 week practicum was divided into two seven week placements within the same school. During the first seven weeks she was placed in Monica's Grade 4/5 combined class for the mornings and Donna's Kindergarten class in the afternoons. During the last seven weeks, Susan was placed in Linda's Special Education class designed to meet the needs of five children with severe behavior problems. Susan also returned to the university on Monday afternoons to attend seminars with other student teachers. As well, a university instructor visited the school to observe her teaching. In these multiple contexts, Susan needed to fulfil different and often conflicting implicit agendas. "Agendas, agendas, agendas. But the thing is, is now the university has a separate agenda and my school has a separate agenda" (S17.3). For example, at the university "they were bragging about this reflection thing. I'm not getting any time and this week I'm supposed to be teaching full time. When do I get time then?" (S17.3). As a university student, Susan was accountable to her professors and herself. As a student teacher, she was accountable to her students, her cooperating teachers, and her two university instructors. Parents, support staff, school administrators, other teachers, children, and social workers would also construct Susan as a character in their stories. Within this context, she hoped to develop her own authority as a teacher.

Visits from a university instructor placed extra strain on Susan as she tried to meet the needs of her students while at the same time fulfilling what she believed were the university instructor's expectations. Susan valued group activities with her students. As we talked about a Math group activity Susan was planning, she said, "But now I'm thinking, oh, he's coming in and I hate working in group activities with these kids because they're so used to seatwork that the management just goes crazy. I'd like to do something a little more, like last time I did a full group activity. I know what he's like and I just, I don't know, it's just this impression you want to leave on this guy. He's evaluating me" (S16.12).

Another visit from the university instructor left Susan flustered and angry. For this lesson, Susan had divided the students into 12 pairs and "they all conferenced and I walked around and conferenced with them in groups of two and then stopped the class and had someone share what they've written so far because they were all really excited to share their stories, right and then continued with the editing, had, well led a small group discussion, comments, questions, continued the editing" (S17.1). As the lesson was

progressing, Susan became upset when the university instructor took Monica, the cooperating teacher, out of the classroom. "And I'm thinking 'What's going on?' you know. It really threw me. I thought, 'Gee, what are they talking about out there that couldn't wait 'til after?'" (S17.1). Susan was also upset that "while I was teaching, he was looking through my binder! Not observing my lesson. He didn't ask me if he could look through my binder, it just happened to be on the desk" (S17.1).

When Susan talked with him after her lesson, "he said he was a little bit concerned, no, he told me that he couldn't find anything. I'm like 'What!?' I have it all laid out in here. I don't see how anyone couldn't find anything. It's all done in dividers" (S17.1). Susan felt invaded as well as confused. "I was so angry. I felt really invaded. That's my binder. You don't go through that without talking to me. Besides the fact that that very Monday [our university seminar leader] had said not to worry too much about our log books. You know, try to keep up and everything else, <u>but</u>, they don't have to be turned in until such and such a date. That was what was said on Monday. I wouldn't have changed anything anyway because I have it all organized for what works for me. But now I have to change what works for me? Because that's what he thinks it should be?" (S17.2).

The comment about the binder's organization would not have been as important if it had not been compounded by comments on Susan's lesson. "At the end of it, like I really didn't care what he had to say about my binder at that time, right. [I wanted] feedback on what you saw. So I asked him, 'What did you think of what you observed today?' He said, 'Well I really didn't see you doing anything.' I was so mad. Ok. Managing twelve groups of two doesn't really mean anything?" (S17.2/3). Susan felt he had used criteria to evaluate how her binder should be organized and what a lesson should look like without acknowledging what she was trying to do. As Susan struggled to develop her narrative knowing of teaching she was also "trying to learn how to deal with all the emotions that you feel every single day. It's very draining. Very draining" (S17.7).

Susan found her weekly university seminar to be a breath of fresh air. "My professor is very positive. What do we want to know, what do we want to do in this classroom, what would be beneficial to us? We all wrote down suggestions. . . . Really good stuff and really it's been get into your groups and talk about what's going on and get up and go to a different group and talk about what's going on and to me, that's such a breath of fresh air again because yes, I am responsible, yes, this is my career" (S16.15).

Susan found an enormous difference between her first and second placements in the same school. "It's a totally different relationship" (S18.13). Susan felt more comfortable in her second placement for a variety of reasons. One reason was having some experience behind her. "I feel a lot more confident in my abilities than I did in

September" (S18.16). Susan felt less fragmented during the second half of her placement where she was placed in one classroom. "I'm not split between two teachers and I have a set routine and the routine is very flexible but it's the same every day. I know what to expect when I go in" (S18.16). Susan also felt better prepared to teach in Linda's Special Education class. "I've been doing my planning, like tomorrow I teach them all day again, but the two lessons that I'm teaching, teacher directed, are prosocial skills. I've had a workshop, two workshops on that and Linda's using the same program that [my university professor] was teaching so I'm pretty confident in that" (S18.16).

Susan found the Special Education class involved "more planning but I also got to know the kids a lot better very quickly. You can't individualize as much in a regular classroom either and that's why it's so hard I think" (S18.17). Meeting the individual needs of her students was important to Susan. "And I found I got a lot more stressed out [in the regular classrooms] just knowing that you're not meeting the needs of all your kids where in this [the Special Education] classroom, it's realistic that I can only meet this many needs, but there's five or six of them so I can do it really well" (S18.18), whereas in the regular classroom "sometimes you felt like 'gee, I didn't even say Hi to Natasha today.' I felt really awful" (S18.18).

Susan also noticed that teaching half-time in the regular classes she "felt very much like Oh, I have three hours and this is what I have to cover and if I don't have it covered, then I'm really behind because tomorrow I have more to cover" (S18.18). In the Special Education class, there was not the same pressure to cover the curriculum. "Academics are very important, but if the behavior gets out of control, no one's going to stand on my neck and say, 'Gee, the curriculum wasn't covered this year Susan.' And I really felt that pressure in that [regular] classroom" (S18.17).

However, Susan was surprised that when she began to consider the individual needs of students, she paid more attention to the curriculum than she had in the regular classroom. "The other thing too that really I've been thinking about in the last couple of weeks is with this classroom, I don't know why, I mean this is contradictory to what I just said, but I look at the curriculum a lot more. Mike is Year 5 in school. He should be at this level. He should be doing these things. So maybe he can't do them at the Grade 5 level, but at least I can expose him to these Grade 5 activities at his own level so I find that I use that a lot more. In Monica's Grade 4/5 class I didn't even use the curriculum. Workbook, this book. Like they're teaching from the text book and that was very much the way she did things" (S18.17).

Susan found she and Linda had a "very similar philosophy and everything else and it's very easy to stick to for me. The routine and the structure is just crucial to these kids"

(S18.18/19). However, at times working with other adults was difficult. "What worries me is I need to know that I'm in charge and they need to know that I'm in charge and if not, I might run into problems because someone else is undermining my authority" (S18.7). One example happened at a school assembly in the gym when Susan was in charge of the Special Education class and Linda was not present. One student was beginning to misbehave, but Susan "was being quite generous with my warnings because I did not want it to escalate to the point where I had to take him to time out. But then Monica, and I was so surprised, I was ticked off at her. She stepped right in and took him to time out which is fine, like understandably she thought she was helping me and everything else, but you know, I didn't learn a damn thing from that. Nothing" (S18.5).

Susan also felt Linda was "in a very unique situation. Linda's mom is a teachers' aide and she pops into the classroom two, three, four times a week" (S18.5). Susan felt "you have to be supportive of one another" (S18.6/7). She found Linda's mom to be "overbearing and like it's great that she wants to be so involved and it's great that the kids like her, but, I am the teacher, you are not. I have to deal with these kids every day whether you're here or not so they need to be respecting me" (S18.6).

Susan could not have confidence in her own abilities and authority as a teacher when others continued to step in and take over. "I said to Linda that I felt that was inappropriate because I said, 'I need to know that when I want something done in this classroom the kids are going to do it because I said so. Not because your mom was there to back me up'" (S18.6).

Episode #2: Parent Meeting

One evening in late September Susan attended a meeting intended to alleviate parents' concerns about combined grade classrooms. This was the first year teachers in the school were expected to work with combined classes and "parents were very concerned about what's going on in that school and they should be. These teachers don't have the skills yet to deal with the combined class" (S16.8).

Susan described the meeting as "a joke. Parent meeting. It wasn't a parent meeting but anyway, they had this speaker and she talked the whole time about the philosophy [behind combined grades]" (S16.8). Susan felt the speaker stressed continuous progress and individual learning. "Her idea is that the curriculum doesn't say anything anywhere about having all the kids grouped in grades which is true. It doesn't. And she wants to get away from talking Grade 4, 5, 6 and talk Year 4, Year 5, Year 6. And none of this failing stuff. Which is, idealistically, a beautiful concept" (S16.8). However, the story the speaker was telling was not the story parents were seeing lived in

their children's classroom. "Realistically what's going on in the classroom is the Grade fours are getting their lesson while the Grade fives have been given their lesson and then it's a flip flop over to the Grade fives, back to the Grade fours. It's separate teaching and this model she's talking about isn't happening. These parents have been observing our classroom. They know what's happening. She talked for an hour straight. Four parents got to speak at the meeting. [When they] asked a question, she talked her way right around it. Drew more examples from her school and her classrooms. Nothing was mentioned about [our school]. Nothing. Not one specific example" (S16.8).

Susan also heard parents' voice concerns about how their children were chosen to be placed in a combined class. While the principal emphasized it had been "a random choice" (S16.19), one parent emphasized that the students felt degraded by being placed in a classroom combined with a lower grade. Even when this parent managed to voice her concern, Susan felt it was not heard, or at least was ignored. "They didn't even hear the problem. I thought boy, you're making your job a lot harder than it has to be because all these parents needed was an ear and some reassurance" (S16.19).

Susan felt parents were concerned about the already heavy workload of teachers being increased. "The parents weren't blaming the teachers at all. They were saying, 'From what I've seen, the teachers are doing their best. They're trying really hard. They have such a difficult job already. Now to add this to it?'" (S16.9). Susan agreed with the view expressed by one parent. "He said, 'It sounds to me like you are going back to the philosophy of the one room schoolhouse.' She didn't address that. How can you argue that? That's exactly what you're trying to do. And why did we do the one room school houses? Number one, we didn't have enough teachers or resources or buildings'" (S16.9). Susan was surprised no one had raised the issue of "funding which was why this combined grade happened. Not one mention of it. And I was surprised that even the parents didn't mention it but they didn't get a chance either" (S16.10).

Susan could imagine individualized instruction working with a small class of children. "I was in Jenny's class today, the adaptation [class]. She has Grade 1 to 6 in there. There's nine of them. It works beautifully" (S16.9). However, Susan felt meeting individual needs was impossible in Monica's combined 4/5 classroom. "When you have 24 students and within Grade 4 you have such a range of abilities, and now you throw in Grade 5 and another range of abilities, it's too much for one person to cope with" (S16.9).

Susan left the meeting feeling frustrated and annoyed by the cover story she had experienced. "Oh, it just made me angry and I thought after, you guys are really digging your own grave because this might be a great idea but you didn't address the concerns of the parents and that's what the meeting was for. That's why they came. You smiled back

and forth at each other, which is what they did" (S16.9). Susan also noticed "a few of the parents stormed out. Angry" (S16.8). When Monica asked Susan "what did you think of that meeting?'" (S16.8), Susan responded, "The speaker was excellent. She knew her stuff. She was very interesting to listen to but I don't think that the goal of that meeting was met at all and I said I think that the parents walked out of there more angry than when they came in because no one listened to them" (S16.9).

Relationships

Susan continued to value developing relationships with individuals. Here in the school, Susan found theory replaced by policy. Susan focused her attention on children she felt had been lost in the policy and curriculum stories of the school system.

Episode #1: Seeing Individual Students

Susan began her practicum placement with Monica's Grade 4/5 combined class in the mornings and Donna's Kindergarten class in the afternoons. Our research conversations were filled with many stories of individual children, children Susan saw as neglected by home, school, and society, children desperately in need of individual attention. "I'm seeing the Cindys that don't get any attention and are constantly after you. I'm seeing the Kathys who's ten years old in Grade 4 looking after her two younger brothers and a younger sister, just like a mother, you know. And I'm seeing the Jasons, two middle class parents out working night shift, leaving their nine year old son home with his 13 year old sister. He's not getting any sleep, he's not coming into school on time, his homework's never finished. To me that's neglect and he wants attention all the time. And on and on it goes right. I'm seeing also the effects down the road, for example where Douglas is heading. Our prison system or drug and alcohol dependency, who knows" (S17.10).

I focus here on Susan's relationship with Kathy and Douglas. Susan struggled to help these two children resist the stories of being lost and ignored she felt had been written for them by others and tried to help them live new stories of being cared for and respected.

Susan's attention was drawn to Kathy, a quiet Grade 4 student who was experiencing difficulties in reading. Kathy's reading difficulties, as well as Kathy herself, often seemed invisible in the bustling combined Grade 4/5 classroom. One day Susan mentioned to Monica, "Kathy wasn't here today" (S16.2/3). Monica replied, "'Yes she was!' And then she looks at me and she goes, 'No, she wasn't. That's awful.' But it's easy. I do it too. If you're quiet and you're a model student really, get all your work done and know the consequences" (S16.2/3).

Susan used a variety of strategies to try to figure out how best to help Kathy. When Susan asked about reading materials at home, the answer was what Susan had suspected. "No, she didn't have books at home, she didn't have magazines, they didn't get the newspaper. I thought ohoh" (S16.1). As Susan paid close attention to Kathy's reading, she began to suspect "a learning disability, I really do, because she reads a page, she's constantly losing her place, she's constantly substituting 'when' for 'then.' Then she'll read it fine. Two words later, it's 'when' or it's 'what' or it's 'and'" (S16.1). Susan noticed "reversals and omissions and insertions" (S16.2) as Kathy read and wanted to "get one of those closed procedure things, after we get into it a bit more. It's too soon yet because I want to get her practicing first and then go through it and really see. Like document it exactly. But I talked to her, I said 'How do you feel about reading?' and this little girl really warmed up to me anyway. She's really quiet in the class, it's really strange" (S16.2).

When Susan asked Kathy how she felt about reading, "She said "'Dumb.' I said, 'Well, you're not dumb. Reading is a hard thing to learn and you just haven't had the chance to learn it and hopefully we can work on it. You know, the one thing that makes reading easier is practice. Read every sign you see. Read, if you're in the grocery store with your mom, read the newspaper headings. Read. Read whatever you can and read all the time and then it becomes fun'" (S16.2).

Susan also set reading goals with Kathy. "So I said, 'We need to set a goal here so we know where we're going,' like how we're doing. I said, 'How many books do you think you can read in a week?'" (S16.1). When Kathy enthusiastically replied, "Twenty!' (laugh) I said, 'Oh, we got pretty ambitious.' I said, 'Boy, you're a real go getter aren't you?' I said, 'Well how many could you read in a day?' They get USSR for 15 minutes and then at home right. She said, 'Two.' I thought that was manageable if they're smaller books so I said, 'Ok, so we'll say 12 a week and two on the weekend,' right" (S16.1).

When Kathy later proudly showed Susan a bookmark, Susan saw another possibility for encouraging Kathy's reading. Susan responded to Kathy,"'What if we start you a collection of bookmarks?' Her eyes just lit up. I said, 'For every five books that you read, I'll give you a bookmark.' I said, 'and by the end of the year, could you imagine, you'll have a real collection' and she was just all excited" (S16.2).

While Susan felt good about helping Kathy, "it scares me because I don't know how she can be so lost in this system. She's in Grade 4 already and she's not even in a resource setting where she's getting this extra, she's only getting this extra time because I'm there" (S16.2).

Susan was also drawn to Douglas, a student in Donna's afternoon Kindergarten class. "Douglas who roams the halls and goes out to the playground and throws temper tantrums and is disruptive if he's not getting the attention he desired. If I'm reading a story, and he wants in on it, but he doesn't want to participate, he'll bang his feet against the filing cabinet repeatedly" (S17.4).

Susan began to dig behind the scenes to try to make sense of Douglas's behavior. She began "reading his cum files" (S16.3) to find possible clues. She found "they've had him assessed, last year in March" (S16.3) but he was still "on a waiting list for speech therapy because he has no speech" (S16.3). Douglas had been assessed with the Peabody Picture Vocabulary test and the WIPPSI and had scored in "the first percentile" (S16.3) on both. "That's borderline mentally retarded. And he's not mentally retarded. He can't do the test because he doesn't have the vocabulary or the skills to do the test. Not that he can't acquire them. He was brought up by his grandmother who does not speak English. And this kid came to school with no speech. Well, of course not because he didn't know the language and the culture is so different" (S16.3).

While Douglas was "a behavior problem, the way to deal with him has been, let him do what he wants in the class no matter what. He's in Grade 1 in the morning and Kindergarten in the afternoon. That was the recommended placement for him" (S16.4). Susan could not see any connections between the test scores and recommendations, the placements, the curriculum, and the curious little boy with big brown eyes. "I have this big question mark in my mind. I'm like, 'This test isn't right. This score can't be right.' But yet they're in files and no one looks at them" (S16.4). Like Susan's brother, Douglas seemed to be expected to know how to fit himself into the existing classroom. Susan was concerned "he can't even function in the Kindergarten class and [Donna] knows nothing about Individualized Educational Programs and she's never had any Special Ed training. As far as these tests, she said, 'I'm so glad you're here. I haven't even looked at his cum files because they don't mean anything to me'" (S16.4).

Susan's concern for constructing a program to meet Douglas's needs led her to approach Donna in the following way. "I don't want to show you any disrespect and I'm not trying to say that I know it all because I don't. I'm wet behind the ears, but from what I do know, he shouldn't even be looking at academics right now as an emphasis" (S16.4/5). Susan believed "the reason he isn't learning as much as the rest of the kids is because he can't focus his attention. He just learned what listening meant" (S16.5).

Susan made a concerted effort to help Douglas. She believed if Douglas was going to learn the "social skills to function in the classroom" (S16.5), he would need to have these skills consistently reinforced. This need for consistent reinforcement created

tensions for Susan in the larger classroom context as other students and Donna became involved in the story. "In the two weeks that I was there, he just learned how to put up his hand before he spoke. And then he puts up his hand (laugh) and you call on him, and he goes on and on and he says it five times but in a different way and he takes ten minutes and all the other kids are sitting there. They're all very patient, but in the meantime I'm just thinking of this excruciating time and what do you do? He's now learned to put up his hand and you have to reinforce that by calling on him and thanking him, or I've said a few times, 'Thanks for putting up your hand, Douglas. If you have something to tell me, you'll have to tell me after. We don't have time right now,' and that's cool with him. The other teacher deals with it by ignoring him and I'm 'Aghhh, he just learned this skill. You have to reinforce or he'll learn that it didn't matter anyways'" (S16.5).

Donna had commented to Susan, "You know, if you weren't in my class, I wouldn't be paying any attention to this and she said, 'And I know that's awful but I have 23 students and he's so time consuming'" (S16.7). However, Susan's focus was different. "The way I look at it is 85% of the kids in this class come from supportive families, parents that are in the school all the time, kids that already have a lot of skills and maybe I'm ripping them off in a way, but those are kids that will survive the school system and this is a kid that won't for sure. His chances two weeks ago were zero and they're slowly working up. But to me, that's where you need to focus. And the rest you go on and do your routine and make your observations and get your feedback, but the focus and the thinking needs to be done about this kid. He's the one that needs it the most" (S16.7).

One of Susan's practicum requirements was to observe two children and write an Individual Educational Program for each one. "These are two students that the teachers chose for me and these teachers don't interact at all because one's a morning teacher and one's an afternoon teacher. By the time the afternoon teacher's there, the morning teacher is gone. Douglas and Kathy are my two. Brother and sister. Wild. . . . And both of them are two that I really took a liking to right away and they would have been my pick. If I had to pick, they would have been my pick" (S16.3). Susan was pleased Kathy and Douglas had been the students chosen for her assignment. However, she had been "observing both of them, just mentally, but not recording a lot of my information because I didn't know that these would be the two that I had. So now, I'm behind the eight ball instead of in front of it. I'm trying to catch up all this observation stuff and work on the academics for Kathy and the skills for Douglas without even knowing their strengths and weaknesses. Backwards" (S16.6).

As her placement in Douglas's classroom was coming to a close, Susan was "concerned about what's going to happen when I'm finished next week. [Donna] doesn't

even really know him. And I've only spent ten minutes a day with him, but I talk to him. I take the time to listen to him" (S17.6).

Susan also took time to listen to Kathy. It was during one of these times that Kathy confided she was being sexually abused by her mother's boyfriend. Susan knew she was required to report this incident. When she told her cooperating teacher and principal, the matter was taken out of her hands. Proper procedures were followed and Kathy, along with Douglas, were swept away, removed from their home and school "because they're the problem . . . and Kathy was very close to her mom so I'm sure that that's very painful for her" (S18.11).

Susan wondered what Kathy had learned from this situation. "And I mean if it happens again and you're in that situation, would you come forward? In a kid's eyes, maybe it's better to tolerate the abuse than to have to deal with what happens when I report it which is really what I think we are teaching them" (S18.11). Susan hoped to be able to find out where Kathy had been sent and re-establish contact with her "because I really would like her to know that she didn't just disappear and everyone forgot about her, you know" (S18.10).

While Susan had tried to provide opportunities for Kathy and Douglas to author new stories of respect, success, and belonging, she felt defeated, angry, and hurt by policies and procedures that seemed to cover over individual circumstances. However, Susan would not choose to give up trying. "That's a cop out. Ok, sit back and don't try. That's better, right? That way you don't get involved, you don't get hurt and life just goes on. Great. That's why we're having the problems we are is because too many people have that attitude" (S18.11). Since Susan was determined to become an advocate for children, she knew she would need to find ways to be heard herself within the system.

Episode #2: Christmas Concert

The last research conversation Susan and I had was during the final week of her practicum amidst Christmas concert preparations. Susan's experience of the Christmas concert dress rehearsal seemed to me to be a nightmare.

Susan's Special Education students were as excited about the dress rehearsal as the rest of the children in the school. "There's parents and stuff watching, all the whole school" (S19.4). However, as last minute preparations were being made, Susan became aware that "none of the Special Ed classes had costumes. We weren't included. We were supposed to make our own. No one told us that or what to make. So here's five little kids, well how would you feel? Totally zero in this and every situation possible, family, home, school, you know. Without costumes. Now what message does that give out?"

(S19.4). When Susan tried to scrounge up costumes, she found "a set of ears for the class, right. One set left. We have two boys that need ears" (S19.4). Mike took them and "Kevin had a major tantrum. Kicking and screaming in the time out room. 'Everybody hates me!'" (S19.4).

Kevin had been placed in the Special Education class in September. "They think that by next year, if this home situation is straightened out, he should be back in a regular classroom and what I mean by his home situation is that his mom, I didn't even realize this until today. His mom just decided that I don't want you anymore and told him that and I should have aborted you like I had planned and your father doesn't want you either" (S18.8).

Kevin had initially been placed in a group home and had recently been placed in a foster home in a small town and was bussed in to the Special Education class in the city. Plans were presently underway to move him to a regular classroom in the school in his foster parents' community. Susan was concerned about the move and the lack of a special placement. "There's no place for him there yet. He just has such a negative self-image that, how are you going to throw him into a regular class now, in January, when all the friends are established and a new town and a new [home]? This poor kid doesn't know if he's coming or going" (S19.8). Susan was angry no one seemed to be questioning a system she felt was victimizing Kevin. "His behavior change since he's come to [our school] is just phenomenal. He's a totally different kid. Now to uproot him will be three schools in less than six months. Three schools and three homes in less than six months! Put an adult into that situation. Nothing is stable. Behavior disorder? Certainly. Why not? Nice system. It will be so disappointing if he leaves us" (S18.8).

This was the story Susan knew of Kevin as she entered the time out room. "So I just stepped in, I opened the door. I said, 'Kevin, this isn't helping. You aren't helping you, you aren't helping me, so get it together (laugh). Things happen like this and you've got to deal with them so let's go.' 'Well, I hate this dumb concert blah blah blah.' I said, 'No you don't.' I said, 'You're angry right now and you know what, I would have been angry about it too.' But how dare you, this poor kid. How dare you treat him like dirt, second rate. But. . ." (S19.7). Susan saw the other students in this class living similar stories.

Susan and another student teacher found some makeup and were "running around painting all the Special Ed kids faces. And Kevin, I painted him up, just for a dress rehearsal but so what? At least he felt important then. I said, 'To me, you look like the best cat out there. You don't have ears, but look at your makeup,' and he was happier than anything" (S19.5).

Susan had used the lack of costumes as a problem solving opportunity. She gathered her students together and said, "Look, you don't have costumes. Ok, we know this. This is a problem, but we can deal with it and we will have costumes for you tomorrow" (S19.7). When the students continued to focus on their lack of costumes, Susan refocused the conversation on ways to deal with the situation. "I said, 'I don't care what we've got to do, but tomorrow we'll have them for you so now, go in there and do your best. That's all you can do.' I mean that was a learning experience for them to not have a fit, you know. And for Kevin to come down out of a tantrum" (S19.7).

Susan felt elated as she watched her students fit themselves in to the dress rehearsal performance. "There's these kids, no costumes. Only ones out of the whole stage. But I was proud of them, boy. They hadn't even practiced with all the others. Donny kind of looked around a bit. I said, 'If you don't know what to do Donny, you do exactly what the person next to you is doing, but make sure he is doing the right thing' (laugh). So he kind of looked around and then followed suit and Amanda followed him, he was helping her. It was great. I said, 'You guys should be proud of yourselves. You did a really good job.' But they need to hear that. Not just 'Oh we didn't get a costume for you. You didn't rehearse with us'" (S19.6).

Knowing as Thinking on My Feet

The practical experience Susan felt was missing throughout her university courses absorbed all her time during her practicum. Here, theory was replaced by practice with no time for reflection in the curriculum story or the new "treadmill" story Susan was experiencing. At the university Susan had been unable to connect her narrative knowing to the theories she was being presented. At the school, Susan had no time to reflect on the theories implicit in her narrative knowing.

Episode #1: Reflecting on Practice

Susan was looking forward to "the way the new practicum is set up so that reflection is hopefully going to be built into it and like you had said earlier, to hopefully make it a lifelong thing as a teacher to be reflective. I think they are trying to build it into the day" (S15.5). Half an hour a day was to be set aside from teaching to provide time for student teachers to keep a reflective journal and discuss teaching practice with each other. While Susan felt "it's important that you have time to synthesize for yourself, to make sense for yourself of what you're doing" (S15.2), she also felt keeping a journal was "sort of a lot to ask in addition to all these things" (S15.2). However, Susan believed her university instructors "want it for your personal and professional development which is

good because now they're treating you as a person and not just a student or a teacher" (S15.2).

Susan soon found the value placed on reflection by university instructors was not part of the elementary school story. Susan described going "into the situation and they were happy with my style and things like that, apparently, because they increased my teaching load'" (S17.3). It did not take long for Susan to describe herself as on "the treadmill" (S17.3).

Susan was overwhelmed by the number of things she felt compelled to do in the limited time available. The school story seemed one of covering rather than understanding. "What you end up falling into is, I can't get all this covered so I'll just tell it and it's a very easy thing to slip into when you're under time constraints like that. But that doesn't mean that they're learning it. That just means that you're covering it and there's a difference between teaching something and covering it" (S17.4).

Susan found herself so busy trying to figure out how to accomplish what had to be done that there was little time left to think about why and even less time to write about it. "I agree writing is important but there's just not the time to say all that you want to say. You know, I find it much easier to verbalize it" (S17.3). Susan soon learned to think on her feet. "I think it's important at the beginning to have that time because you're seeing so much. It's nice to have that half hour where you can sit by yourself or chat with someone while you're writing about what's going on. But towards the end I find it totally useless. I find this reflective journal totally useless towards the end because I do it anyway. I don't need to write it down. I am a thinking person. I can think about these things" (S18.1).

Susan also realized "real" teachers did not have or take the opportunity to step back to reflect on their practice. One aspect of becoming a real teacher for Susan meant being with her students. "It really breaks up the afternoon if you leave for half an hour and it also reflects, the kids really are perceptive and they pick up on that, gee, how come she leaves for half an hour every day? She's not the 'real' teacher. And every kid that I've had so far has perceived me, I'm saying this by their behavior, as the 'real' teacher and I think it's because I don't take off for half an hour a day. Like they understand that when I am in the classroom I am the teacher so treat me accordingly" (S18.1).

Susan felt strongly that "my responsibility is in this classroom" (S18.4). Meeting with other student teachers during school time to reflect on practice was "secondary. It's gab usually" (S18.4). Susan felt that even when these sessions got to "the point of being so how do you handle that? Or what did you do? What did you say? Or I would have done this or maybe I should try" (S18.4), she would rather learn it through classroom experience than by talking about her classroom experience. "I just feel like I don't really

want to learn it here. I'd sooner learn it by experience in the classroom. And my teachers, for the most part, have been ones that I could talk to and say . . . could you explain why you did that? Or why you do this in your classroom. Not to say that I have to agree with you but at least now I have something more concrete to say about it, this is why she did it" (S18.4).

Susan found the reflective sessions were "bound to end up to be a bitch session because that's the only time where you're in private, the four of you, and you can say, 'Oh gee, she's driving me up the wall. This is what she did today.' Well, you know, I think that I could think of enough things to bitch about on my own without having people help me out (laugh)" (S18.4). Susan also felt "I don't really want to confide things like that because who knows where it ends up" (S18.3). Talking with teachers and talking about teachers created two very different kinds of conversations. Susan wanted to hear the teachers' point of view in order to understand the classroom from their perspective. She felt the questions she asked them were being answered by someone with the authority of experience. Talking with her own student peers did little to expand her perspectives on teaching.

As Susan thought about beginning the second seven weeks of her practicum in one of the Special Education classes, she imagined "it'll be different. That's for sure. Well it'll be a nice change you know. And it will be almost a load off a bit" (S17.11) with one class and fewer children. Susan hoped to have some time to observe what was happening in her new classroom. "I'm looking forward to it. I'm looking forward to next week which is supposed to be observation only. I hope so (laugh)" (S17.11).

When I mentioned I thought Susan's heavy teaching load during the first seven weeks was "meant to be a compliment," she replied, "Well I think that maybe it is, but you know what's missing that's key out of that whole equation? I haven't really been told that I'm doing a good job and I haven't really been told that they're impressed with how much I'm handling. I haven't been told that, you know, here's a few areas I think you could work on but here are the areas where I think you are very strong. Still improve of course, you're still evolving, right, but, you can't hear this needs to be better, that needs to be better, you need to get this done too, you need to have that done too all the time. It's destructive (laugh)" (S17.8).

Susan found teaching to be much harder than she had ever imagined. "This might change as I get into my career a bit more, but I don't see how you can be a fully dedicated, super, effective teacher for 20 years like I've seen in the system. I think it's impossible. I think the burn out rate is very high and it should be high. I think it should be really high because you need new people in all the time, all the time because it's a hard job. I would

honestly say that it's one of the hardest jobs. It's much harder than I ever imagined and I thought that I'd prepared myself for hard work. And I'm not even doing all of it" (S17.7).

At this point Susan felt "that I have to lighten up a bit, like obviously I'm pretty negative right now. . . . I'm going to put my time and energy into it, try to give it a good two years, maybe three, but I honestly think that I won't be able to survive in this system just because it's too hard. It's too emotionally hard" (S17.10).

CHAPTER SIX

> The author of a story has a particular moral perspective on behalf of which he wants to claim authority, and, therefore, on behalf of which he wants to argue. Consequently, his role as an author is to convince his audience of both the legitimacy of his moral perspective and the righteousness of his actions in the story he tells.
>
> (Tappan & Brown, 1989, p. 195)

AUTHORIZING STORIES OF GOOD TEACHING

Zach and Susan came to their teacher education programs with a wealth of personal practical knowledge of what it meant to teach and to learn in our Western Canadian society. As I listened to Zach's and Susan's stories, I was amazed at how differently they constructed knowledge about teaching and learning. I was equally amazed at how consistent and pervasive their constructions were. These constructions provided Zach and Susan with a consistent world view which they used to shape the stories they were being told by others as well as to shape the stories they chose to tell and live themselves.

Both Zach and Susan entered their teacher education programs wanting to become good teachers. They brought with them images of good teaching embodied within their personal practical knowledge. In order to be accredited as good teachers, they needed to complete a degree program established by a university and to complete certification requirements. They chose the Bachelor of Education, a program designed to educate good teachers.

To become good teachers, both Zach and Susan needed to be accredited by those who lived the academically authorized versions of teaching and learning. As characters in the university's and the schools' authorized versions of teacher education, authoring their stories of becoming good teachers was contingent on the authority of others who would evaluate the stories Zach and Susan chose to tell and live as student teachers.

The socially interactive complexity of learning to teach becomes clear when we understand Zach and Susan constructed and reconstructed knowledge through their experiences of teacher education in the contexts of university classrooms and school classrooms where university teachers, cooperating teachers, student peers, and students they themselves would be expected to teach were all part of the interactive contexts of constructing knowledge. Each of these individuals also had particular constructions of teaching and learning embodied in their own personal practical knowledge.

Zach and Susan needed to learn to live and tell the versions of teacher education being storied by their university teachers and cooperating teachers. The stories Zach and Susan were given back by those who were already accredited as teachers let Zach and Susan know if they were making the kinds of choices which were valued by those who were already teachers.

Each university teacher and cooperating teacher had images of good teaching based on his/her own personal practical knowledge developed through his/her own experience and constructed in his/her own unique way. As Zach and Susan authored their lives as education students, they used their personal practical knowledge of good teaching to choose what to pay attention to in their courses. At the same time, as characters in their teacher education programs, they also knew they needed to figure out what each professor and cooperating teacher knew and expected them to know.

Zach and Susan needed to figure out what each university teacher and cooperating teacher considered to be good teaching in order to complete assignments in ways that would get them good marks which would in turn show that they could become good teachers. Although the ways in which they completed assignments did not necessarily fit with their own images of good teaching, what became problematic was figuring out how each professor and cooperating teacher storied good teaching rather than paying attention to their own underlying assumptions about good teaching.

Zach and Susan knew their images of good teaching might need to be set aside as they tried to figure out what was expected of them. However, since knowledge is constructed and reconstructed through personal practical knowledge, this was exactly what they did use to make sense of their programs. Zach's and Susan's education as teachers appeared to be mediated through the body of paradigmatic knowledge they were trying to acquire. While this was the knowledge that counted for credit in their coursework, it was the personal practical knowledge of both Zach and Susan and their professors which shaped and reshaped what was being learned. It is ironic that while Zach and Susan constructed and reconstructed their knowledge of good teaching based on their personal practical knowledge, they left their programs never having this knowledge acknowledged as important by either their teachers or themselves. Thus Zach and Susan both learned to conform to the teachers' agendas to get the marks to show officially that they would be good teachers. Since their personal practical knowledge did not appear to count, it was not explored as a worthwhile component of becoming a good teacher. Never having questioned their underlying assumptions about good teaching, they continued to hold the images of good teaching which they brought to their programs.

While Zach and Susan each had different images of good teaching, these images had also been shaped by "sacred stories" of technical rationalism and apprenticeship they had implicitly learned from their experiences with school, family, and society. The ways in which Zach and Susan authored their lives as teacher education students were shaped by the implicit sacred stories of technical rationalism and apprenticeship which would enable them to receive an education from those who were already experts. The underlying sacred stories of objective truth, certainty, prediction and control told in technical rationalism were echoed in the apprenticeship stories of learning to do it right, being prepared and well planned, and having everything under control.

The teacher education programs Zach and Susan experienced explicitly valued reflective practice and openness to inquiry. However, the underlying sacred story of technical rationalism which values certainty, prediction, and control and the complementary story of apprenticeship where practicing what we know can lead to perfection, implicitly shaped the institutional narratives in their structure, evaluation, and expectations both at the university and in the schools.

The narrative inquiry method I had chosen for our research contrasted sharply with the institutional narratives of teacher education. I had taken the epistemological stance of knowledge constructed and reconstructed through experience where knowledge is socially constructed and negotiated as individuals continuously interact with the world. The story of teacher education both Zach and Susan had constructed was one of expecting to learn how to teach through the presentation of theories based on technical rationalism and an apprenticeship model of practice teaching. Zach and Susan expected to learn the institutional teacher education stories described by Ginsburg and Clift (1990) where knowledge was constructed as public rather than private, molecular rather than holistic, and given rather then problematic. Our narrative inquiry was a competing story to the version of education being authorized by the official curriculum. Zach and Susan were struggling to make sense of the authorized institutional story of certainty they felt expected to learn to live and tell in order to get the credits they needed to complete their degrees. As they tried to construct stories of themselves as becoming more certain of their abilities to become good teachers, I found it extremely difficult to ask them to open themselves to the confusion of questioning their own knowing and of trying to think of alternate possibilities.

In this chapter I show how Zach and Susan experienced trying to author their own good teaching stories while at the same time being characters in the good teaching stories constructed by university teachers and cooperating teachers. While the choices they made were expressions of their moral stance in the world, they knew they were accountable not

only to themselves, but to their professors, their cooperating teachers, and their students for those choices.

I now focus on ways in which Zach's and Susan's stories were shaped by their personal practical knowledge as well as by the institutional narratives in which their programs were embedded. I show ways in which Zach's and Susan's images of good teaching were storied in response to the stories they felt compelled to live and tell in their teacher education programs. I point to ways in which the sacred stories of technical rationalism and apprenticeship adhere to a plot line of getting an education which competes against the sacred story of becoming more experienced through inquiry focused on narrative knowing.

Constructing Knowledge as Paths and Webs

I begin by exploring two distinct world views constructed by Zach and Susan in which their images of good teaching were embedded. How they each came to know their world was shaped by, and shaped, their views of knowledge and their relationships with others. I first turn to Zach's image of good teaching in "The Curriculum Path." I then move to Susan's image of good teaching in "A Web of Relationships."

Zach: The Curriculum Path

Zach's saw his narrative as a straightforward story. He imagined life in general and education in particular as a path.

> It's the path of life, it's the same path. It's not that different. We all hit the same stage. We all are trying to achieve generally the same things. Not the same job or whatever but we all want to live, we all want to live comfortably. We all have the same goals. Some to a higher extent than others and possibly different ideas of what success is. But we have the idea of success and it's just our nature to go for it. Now, if it's easier for us to go for it or harder, that's education. (Z14.31)

This image pervaded the way in which Zach constructed and reconstructed knowledge during the time we spent together.

Zach's path image was shaped by boundaries which set limits for his choices on the path. He knew he would need to find a balance as he moved along the path by making choices depending on contextual contingencies. These choices would usually be somewhere in the middle between the dichotomous extremes at the boundaries. This path was constructed moment by moment as Zach made choices of how to live his life. Choices

could not be made ahead of time because he could not predict exactly what would happen in situations. Thus, it became important to be able to read the situation in order to make appropriate choices. Choices needed to be made in order to make things happen and to keep the forward momentum.

This image pervaded the way Zach authored his life. In order to progress, it was crucial for Zach to keep moving along the path in his knowing and in his actions. On the path he accumulated knowledge and experience. He could not change what had passed, but could use his new knowledge and experience to make more informed decisions in the future. He looked forward rather than back. He wanted to have a glimpse of what was ahead of him, but knew he could only live in the present moment. He priorized what he hoped to accomplish and preferred to complete one thing before moving on to the next.

For Zach, what counted as knowledge were the objective facts he must pass on to his students. To be a good teacher, he would need to help his students attain the skills they would need to make choices which would enable them to move more easily along the path. He would also need to look back in order to be able to see where his students were on the curriculum path and to help them take their own steps and make their own choices. Lifelong learning meant accumulating knowledge as he moved along the path. Teaching was giving his students the skills to acquire knowledge for themselves.

> You have to isolate individual steps that you went through to get where you are, to get that knowledge that you're trying to give to them because you're not there to give them the end, the cure, the true answer. You're there to help bring them along, following behind you in the same footsteps you followed, you did. They're not going to be the same foot steps. They're going to be a different size, slightly different path but similar, generally the same. (Z14.29)

As a good teacher, Zach would need to keep his students on the path as well as allow them their own choices. Students wandering off on their own could get lost. He would need to make the curriculum relevant for his students in order to draw them in to the curriculum path.

Zach at times was taken aback when his personal practical knowledge and the professional knowledge with which he was being presented conflicted. When this happened, his path image, one generally consistent with his teacher education program, led him to stop a moment or make a small detour and then get back on track.

Susan: A Web of Relationships

Susan constructed her knowing in and of the world as an interdependent web of relationships. "I don't think anyone is ever alone in anything. There's always a web, an interdependency or a relationship somehow" (S6.19). She also knew she lived in a world where the predominant story was of a world constructed as linear and hierarchical. Susan often felt torn as she found herself trying to live these two competing narratives. Susan continually tried to integrate her knowing of the world as filled with contextual contingencies with her desire for objective certainty. She struggled to keep her integrity with the way she knew the world through her personal practical knowledge while at the same time develop and maintain relationships with others who knew the world differently. Susan wanted to understand how others' experience was similar to or different from her own. Susan became angry and frustrated at "the flow" which for her was a cover story that denied individual experience and covered up underlying assumptions. She continually tried to find a common ground which would make a space for getting at underlying assumptions. She valued a variety of perspectives which she tried to integrate into a "broader picture."

Susan enacted the web image as she tried to incorporate her past experience and future intentions into her present teacher education program. As well, her teacher education program was integral with other relationships in her life. For Susan, finding a balance involved making choices which would enable her to maintain her relationships with others while at the same time maintaining the integrity which fit with her personal practical knowledge (Brown & Gilligan, 1992). At the same time, Susan tried to integrate the public, molecular, and given view of knowledge into her personal practical knowledge. At times she felt compelled to tell a cover story of "going with the flow" which did not express the story she was living.

As a good teacher, Susan knew she needed to acquire the professional knowledge she believed all teachers held. She wanted to understand a variety of perspectives in order to have the broadest understanding of educational issues possible. She also knew it would be crucial for her to understand each individual child's way of experiencing the world in order to help each child learn. As a good teacher, she would need to construct a curriculum that fit each child rather than trying to get each child to fit a predetermined curriculum.

Susan was often beside herself as she tried to construct a version of teaching and learning which fit both her image of life as an interdependent web of contextual relationships and the dominant image she felt compelled to author of learning as linear and hierarchical.

The Authority of Knowledge

Both Zach and Susan came to their teacher education programs expecting to be educated as teachers. Getting an education implies a particular body of knowledge that can be transmitted from expert to novice. For Zach and Susan, this image of good teaching led them to expect their university teachers to provide them with the information they would need to know in order to become teachers themselves. Zach and Susan expected to receive their education from those who already knew how to teach and to be evaluated on what they had learned through the paradigmatic mode. This would provide them with the objective body of professional knowledge they would need to become good teachers. Both felt their personal beliefs and values could bias the professional paradigmatic knowledge they expected to receive. Professional paradigmatic knowledge would be received from others. As teachers, they would be responsible for figuring out where their students were at and for creating developmentally appropriate lessons for their students. In order to do this, they would need to know more than their students. This information would be built up from a solid base.

Both Zach and Susan were concerned about whether they knew enough to be able to teach. Being able to present what they knew would give them each the sense of certainty and confidence they would need to make responsible professional decisions. This was the underlying sacred story of technical rationalism.

Zach: Building Up a Body of Knowledge

While Zach implicitly valued his own narrative knowing, he did not count reflection on his narrative knowledge as part of his teacher education program nor important to teaching students. For Zach, experience could not count as knowledge since everyone's experience was different and experience is always changing. Knowledge was objective and certain, not transient and contextual. He knew curriculum knowledge was public, molecular, and given while his experiential knowledge was personal, holistic, and problematic.

Zach's narrative knowledge in the world and of the world was linear and hierarchical. Learning something new meant moving on, not looking back. Knowledge was built from a solid base and acquired as he moved along the path. He believed constructing knowledge meant receiving knowledge from those further ahead on the path and then choosing the ideas that fit with his narrative knowing. How he (and others) chose to use the knowledge they received would depend on the particular situations encountered as they travelled along the path of life.

On the path, Zach knew he needed to know something before he could use it or teach it. Since learning involved receiving knowledge from those who already knew the authorized versions, teaching would involve passing on knowledge already constructed and accepted as authorized versions. He knew his authority in his position as a teacher would come from knowing more than his students. If he was going to expect them to follow his lead, he would need to know where he was going and how to get there. He would also need to be able to think critically in order to choose among alternatives in situations. Being aware of the two opposing sides of an issue would help Zach frame the way in which he could choose to read and respond to a situation.

Susan: Gaining a Variety of Perspectives

Susan's image of the world as an interdependent web of relationships led her to try to integrate her narrative knowledge of the world as personal, holistic, and problematic with the more dominant view of knowledge as public, molecular, and given. When the knowledge she was "given" was not as clear as she expected it to be, she wanted to dig deeper to get at underlying assumptions. She believed she could get at the reality behind the cover story she felt she was being presented. She wanted to know about some of the problems she knew she would encounter within the contextual contingencies of her classroom.

For her, experience and knowledge were integral. She knew each person had different views based in his/her own personal practical knowledge. She wanted to hear a variety of views because each person's views were limited by their personal experience. Being open to a variety of views could uncover personal biases and illuminate underlying realities. Susan believed there were basic ingredients for good teaching. She wanted to understand these in order to be able to combine and use them in particular situations.

Because knowledge and experience were integral, Susan learned while doing. Receiving a body of knowledge made little sense until Susan could connect the knowledge she was receiving with her personal practical knowledge. She needed to contextualize theoretical concepts in order to make sense of them. She became annoyed when her personal knowledge was seen as irrelevant.

For Susan, thinking about what she knew and how she knew it was crucial. She wanted to uncover the taken-for-granted assumptions of herself and others in order to understand more about learning as well as to open lines of communication with others and create a better society.

Authoring Relationships with Others

For both Zach and Susan, developing relationships with others was based on respect. The ways in which they each storied respect for others reflected their constructions of the world and their beliefs about knowledge.

Zach: Respecting Authority of Position

For Zach, the linear hierarchical nature of knowledge was reflected within educational institutions where relationships were positional. Those who knew more were entitled to a higher position. At the same time, those in higher positions would have the knowledge to help those with less knowledge. As one gained more knowledge along the curriculum path, one also gained in status. Those who knew more deserved to be listened to. Those who knew less deserved to be helped. Questioning the knowledge of those in positions of authority would be disrespectful.

Zach noted a pivotal tension between individual freedom and social responsibility. He emphasized the importance of being able to fit in and work together while at the same time being free to make individual choices. In order to ensure that both individual freedom and social responsibility would occur, Zach believed there had to be a leader to keep society humming along. If there was no leader, people would go in their own separate directions and society would not progress.

Since everyone wanted to live life in his/her own way, those who were in positions of authority would set rules to ensure people had individual freedom while also respecting the rights of others. As a student, Zach would need to follow the rules of the game set by others until he himself gained enough authority to set rules himself. Since we live together in society, communication with others was crucial and so rules were also important for clear understanding.

Getting along with others was part of Zach's narrative knowing when he entered his program. Through his experience he knew these relationships would come naturally to him as a teacher. He did not view his future relationships with his students as problematic. Here he would need to depend on the narrative knowing he had constructed from previous experience. However, Zach was not able to name this as knowledge.

Susan: Respecting Authority of Experience

For Susan, relationships with others were at the center of teaching and learning. Respecting each person as an individual with his/her own experiential knowing was essential in order for understanding to develop. Because each person's knowledge was

shaped by his/her experience, understanding what he/she knew and how he/she knew it would give Susan both a new perspective as well as a better understanding of each individual. Because each person's story was not the "whole" story, Susan hoped to learn more by hearing many different versions. As Susan questioned others to get a better understanding of the meanings they were constructing, she often felt these questions were storied as disrespect for positions of authority.

Susan was able to make her own connections with the contextual contingencies expressed by others, connections which were missing from decontextualized theories.

Susan wanted to be respected as a person rather than treated as a student. She became annoyed with others who seemed to respect the position rather than the person. The hierarchical relationships which existed within educational institutions competed with Susan's desire to work together in a community.

As a teacher, Susan wanted to work with her students as well as with parents and other teachers in ways which would open communication. She felt each person could have some knowledge to contribute that would both help her students and herself as a teacher.

Choosing to Author Stories of Good Teaching

The choices Zach and Susan made in authoring stories of good teaching were shaped by their personal practical knowledge which shaped, and was shaped, by their beliefs about how knowledge was constructed within their worlds. How they believed knowledge was constructed in turn shaped and was shaped by their beliefs about the kinds of relationships required for teaching and learning to occur. Parajes (1992) tells us

> Existential presumptions are the incontrovertible, personal truths everyone holds. Rokeach (1968) suggested that they are the taken-for-granted beliefs about physical and social reality and self and that to question them is to question one's own sanity. As such, they are deeply personal, rather than universal, and unaffected by persuasion. (p. 309)

Zach's and Susan's beliefs about teaching and learning were integral expressions of their personal practical knowledge constructed and reconstructed through experience.

I now show how Zach and Susan enacted their personal practical knowledge of good teaching through their teacher education programs. I begin with my research story of Zach's experience which I have named "Fitting In." I then turn to the research story I have constructed of Susan's experience which I have named "Surviving the System."

Zach: Fitting In

Prelude: Fitting into the Situation

Zach entered his teacher education program with narrative knowledge of the importance of having rules that would help people work together in a society. For Zach, each situation was a kind of game and in order to become a player he would need to figure out the rules set by the "master players" (Carse, 1986). To become a teacher, he had to understand the particular rules he would be expected to follow in order to fit in. It was his responsibility to fit himself into the situation because "it's easier for one person to change himself than for an entire event to change itself to you" (Z4.5). Zach knew authoring his life as a teacher meant becoming a character in the university's teacher education program. "This is the compromise I have chosen to live in and since I've chosen to live here I have to live by the rules" (Z3.8). Although Zach did not like some of the rules, he did not believe it was his place to question them until he understood them.

> The only way you can do anything, either for or against something is to become part of it. You must play by the rules before you can break the rules. And if you want to understand it, first of all you have to find out what the societal norm is for understanding that. Because you can't say somebody else is wrong until you find out what they're thinking, right. And why they're thinking it. Because maybe they are right. So you have to play by the rules. You have to get into it. (Z4.17)

When Zach began his teacher education program, he knew in order to author his life as a teacher, he would need to be well versed in the subject area content he would need to pass on to his future students. "You can learn something together, but you cannot teach somebody else something until you know it" (Z4.15). His authority as a teacher would come from what he knew and how well he could pass this knowledge on to his students. To be listened to as a teacher, Zach would need to know what he was talking about and be able to communicate this knowledge clearly. For Zach "as the teacher it's your duty, your job, whatever, to speak clearly and that's one thing I notice I don't do well enough yet. At least not to my standards of what I think should be" (Z4.1).

In order to be listened to, Zach believed he needed to speak and write in ways that "follow the rules so everybody can understand" (Z4.4). For Zach, this meant being clear, credible, and persuasive. He emphasized the importance of "punctuation, grammar, syntax, everything that helps put it together. Is it put together right?" (Z4.3). For Zach, rules were important because "these rules that we have, are the only things that guide how we speak and what we speak actually to make it clear for the next person to understand

what we're saying" (Z4.3). As a teacher, being clear would mean being logical, sequential and concise. This would be necessary to keep his students' attention and for the students to understand what Zach was teaching them.

For Zach to be listened to by his university instructors, he knew he would need to give an account that fit the version they expected. Zach had learned to construct arguments in his university papers to convince his instructors he knew what he was talking about. Authoring well constructed arguments fit with Zach's personal practical knowledge of argument as a way to develop his own voice of authority as he clarified his own knowing and persuaded others he was right "because my point is better, because it is thought out and I've managed to think out somebody else's argument. Clarified it in my own mind and then override it with things I've found" (Z4.8).

Zach also knew in order to have his views accepted, his own voice was not enough. He needed to find support for his ideas from those already entitled to do so. "According to the rules of the university you have to have somebody with a doctorate in front of their name prove it for you" (Z4.13). Zach struggled to give voice to his knowing by finding words of those in authority which fit with his personal practical knowledge because "you need something to give your paper or your statement credibility. It's not just off the top of my head" (Z4.13). Zach knew he needed to fit in to the hierarchical institutional story where

> Learning and discovering are two different things. You learn what is past because you can only learn something that is already there. You can discover something new. But then, because you're a student, or only a teacher, you're not a doctor, whatever you discover doesn't count unless someone else discovers it with a doctor in front of their name (laugh). I'm pessimistic in that. I don't like that rule. I don't like the fact that just because I don't have all this "cultural capital" lugging behind me, the fact that I don't have that means that I'm not smart enough to come up with a new idea, according to the institution. But somebody in the upper ranks must protect their position. Therefore, they're the only ones that can come up with new ideas and anyone lower coming up with those ideas would challenge that position. So they wouldn't accept it and that's the hierarchy. There's nothing you can do about it. The only way you can beat that is to go through the motions and attain that cultural capital, and then you can do it your way, but by that time, you're so engrained in the institutional way of doing things you're probably going to do exactly the same thing they've been doing. I don't know. I hope not. You can always hope. (Z4.15)

While Zach knew he needed to fit into the existing power structure of "the institution" (Z4.16), he was concerned about the imposition of dominance on a global level because "if it continues, it'll be the end of the world" (Z1.7). However, as a teacher Zach could "see my position because of the institution, I can see my position being the dominant

one and I don't have a problem with that because there must be a leader somewhere and the institution decides it's going to be me" (Z4.11). In order to be a good teacher, Zach would need to be the kind of leader his students would want to follow.

Zach believed it was possible to make changes as long as he could justify them. "Just do it your own way because you know it's right, but know why it's right. You must be able to back yourself up. Why is your way better than the other way? And if you can back all that up, do it and face the consequences" (Z4.16). However, as Zach was trying to understand what those already in authority believed was the right way, he had little opportunity to think about what his way might be.

Chapter One: Reading the Situation

In order to become a teacher, he would need to "follow the boundaries, the rules, the path, whatever you want to call it, that is set out by whoever controls that end goal" (Z8.14). Zach knew he needed to choose from the authorized scripts set out for him as he would expect his students to do once he became a teacher.

Zach trusted that his university instructors would present him with the knowledge he would need to become a good teacher. He knew it would be out of place for him to question the reasons behind what he was being taught. His role as a student was to accept what he was told. Once he had completed his degree and become a practising teacher he could "consider myself more knowledgeable and render an opinion. But until I've done it, finished this little exercise called a degree, I can't render an opinion because I don't know anything about it" (Z8.14).

Zach believed his university courses would help him become "aware of the different possibilities. As soon as you're aware of them, then suddenly they fall into place" (Z6.13). Zach was initially willing to accept the different possibilities he was being presented. "Once I understand it, then I can start to change it" (Z6.28).

Zach knew part of the game involved staying within the boundaries on the path set by the course "since the course calls for this particular piece of knowledge to be installed into the student's mind" (Z8.5). He would also need to pay close attention to the instructor's area of expertise which was an expression of his/her particular belief system, "otherwise that instructor never would have done his doctorate in that thing because that's what he believes is right" (Z8.4). Zach would need to acknowledge these values and stay within the boundaries in order to get a good evaluation. "So, while you may introduce some of the other areas you're in, the final word is always going to be in that area of the instructor's expertise. So you have to stay within the boundaries. Don't venture too far

because you're going to get your fingers slapped" (Z8.4). For Zach, getting your fingers slapped meant getting a poor evaluation.

Because the teacher was an expert who holds a particular body of professional knowledge, as a student, Zach needed to avoid "uncharted knowledge" (Z8.5). It would be inappropriate for Zach as a student to contribute new knowledge in class because "nobody's going to be an expert on that and you're suddenly placing the instructor at risk because he's no longer the expert in whatever you're trying to get into" (Z8.5). It would be disrespectful to publicly challenge his teachers' knowledge as this would challenge their position of authority. As a student Zach would need to stay within what he perceived were the boundaries preset by his instructors.

The boundaries would frame what Zach needed to pay attention to in order to become a good teacher. However, the way he chose to fit into that frame was "not set by the course. It's set by yourself" (Z8.6). The authorized versions would help him think about the versions he would be accountable for living. "[The course] is forcing you to take a stand, find out where you are, because that's the key, is knowing where you stand. The reason for a lot of these courses now is to show you the two outside boundaries" (Z8.6).

Zach knew the outside boundaries represented two extremes and he needed to find a balance which fit with his personal practical knowledge and the particular classroom situation. As Zach imagined himself as a teacher, he believed he would need to draw the students in, stimulate their interests in what he was required to teach. In this way Zach implicitly knew the value of the personal practical knowledge of his students. "If they don't somehow get drawn in, there will be no interest. You have to connect with them and in order to connect with them you must be allowing them their own participation" (Z7.7). When his instructors described lessons as teacher centered or student centered, Zach privately questioned this distinction. "That's all fine but they are not individual concepts" (Z7.6). He believed both the teacher and the students needed to contribute to each lesson; lessons could not be one or the other. "A lot of the stuff is teacher initiated but that's not teacher-centered. You're just basically sending them in the right direction and then you're making sure they're not going too far off the path but they're still wandering on their own" (Z7.6). When Zach was asked to author a teacher centered lesson, I could see the tension created as he worried about receiving a poor evaluation when he chose to construct the lesson in a way which fit the values expressed in his personal practical knowledge of good teaching. "As for my demonstration with the saddle, a lot of it is going to be demonstration. Teacher oriented. But there will be some involvement where I will be pulling students in so it's not totally teacher oriented. So, am I going to lose marks for

that? I have to question on that because I don't like the fact that I do one or the other. They're both together" (Z6.3).

Zach imagined that in his approaching practicum, he would still have to acknowledge the values of the authorities in the existing system and add his own ideas carefully. He knew he would need to fit into the versions of good teaching authored by his cooperating teacher in order to become a member of the teaching community.

> You have to get used to that school's rules, not so much the school's rules, but that individual's rules for doing things and the way they do things because they are the ones that are writing up your evaluation. So you have to be, yes, trying new things, to a point. But you must be following their way of doing things in order to appear like a good teacher because the way they teach is the way they figure is the right way to teach. So you must incorporate some of their things into your way, some of their methods into your way of teaching. At least for that particular exercise because that's the way you're going to get a good evaluation. (Z8.3)

When Zach became a teacher it would be his responsibility to authorize the rules within his own classroom "so they're giving me a little bit of background on why and what reasoning I should be looking at when I do set my rules" (Z8.15). However, in order to change authorized versions within the larger educational community, he would first need to move up in the educational hierarchy. "In my classroom, in my little world I can change. But if I want to carry on and change a few of the other worlds, being the other classrooms then I must move upward. But in order to get to that position you must play by the existing rules. You can't change the rules until you have the power to do so" (Z7.11).

While Zach knew as a teacher he would "call the situations as you see them because every situation will be different and it would be wrong to try and set up some method" (Z6.13), he had learned in his university classes that it was necessary to have some procedures and expectations set out ahead of time. This fit with Zach's path image. "If there's nothing set up before hand, the students don't know what to do and it's every man for himself and that creates problems" (Z10.6). As a teacher Zach would need to find his own balance between being preplanned and reading the situation as it happened. "They're pretty big on preplanned rules and procedures but, they're also at the same point saying don't have too many of them. Have a few" (Z10.6).

As Zach recognized familiar concepts repeated in different classes, he told me, "I have some place to start. I'm not grasping at air anymore. There's something there and all I'm doing is building on it. That makes it easier" (Z6.25). The different perspectives he was being presented became an embodied part of Zach's personal practical knowledge and began to fit together. "Everything's the same. Slightly different angles, but all the same

anyway" (Z5.6). Zach began to believe he could fit in as stories authorized in the teaching community were becoming part of his narrative history. "Suddenly the fact that you are starting to go over things or pull things that you do know means you have a base. You're not waiting for somebody to give it to you. You've got it. Nobody can take it away from you" (Z7.27). He began to see himself as having a body of professional knowledge which he in turn could now pass on to his students. While he was further ahead of his students on the curriculum path, his position as teacher was not to impress them with what he knew, but to teach them what they needed to know "at the level that everybody can understand where it's not too easy for some, but you're better off being too easy for a couple than being too hard for the majority" (Z7.6).

As the time for his practicum approached, Zach became more and more concerned about his knowledge of French. Since for Zach, authority was connected to both how much he knew and how well he was able to express what he knew, he felt insecure about teaching French. In Social Studies he felt personally and professionally competent; in French he felt neither. Because he was required to do his coming practicum in his French minor, Zach would need to learn how to assert his authority as a teacher in the area where he felt least competent to do so.

When Zach went to the school to meet Pat, his cooperating teacher, he noticed many ways in which Pat's attitudes toward teaching were similar to his own. Zach's initial sense of rapport with Pat made him feel comfortable enough to confide his concern with not knowing enough. Pat's reassurance was a relief.

> The fact that I'm going to know what I'm talking about is all I need. As soon as I know that, the rest falls in place. Strange. That's my first concern always. Do I know this stuff? Am I qualified to be up at the front of these people trying to tell them something? If I have that, having transactions with people works just naturally. I like that and I don't worry about that. It just happens. It's just the subject stuff that I have the problem with. And I don't have to worry about it. That's good. (Z10.11/12)

Chapter Two: Making it Happen

In his practicum Zach needed to construct stories of himself as a student and a teacher simultaneously. As a teacher he knew he would be held accountable for his students' actions as well as his own. "You're not only given the right, you're given the expectation that you must do this. You don't have a choice right. You have some choices in how you go about doing it but this is what is expected" (Z14.14). The support he

received from Pat and the rest of the staff helped Zach feel "like I belong there. I feel at home" (Z11.3).

As a student teacher Zach would be replacing Pat's position as teacher for a short time. Zach knew he was entering the ongoing classroom story and as such was placed in the position of being expected to author future stories while simultaneously learning and fitting in with the story Pat and her class were living "because she's going to have to pick up my pieces when I leave so if I'm not up to par, then she's going to have a problem and that's not fair. She's being too damned nice to do that to her. Somehow, someway, I will get this done. How, I haven't quite figured out yet" (Z11.5). Zach also knew he would need to stay within Pat's plot outlines since she was ultimately accountable to those above her as well as to her students. As a teacher, the curriculum became the path within the school context. "It's what I must follow" (Z14.14/15).

Zach was authoring his life on this path as well. "I'm just at a point. Because I'm on that path too. Because my path doesn't stop until the end as we know it" (Z14.30). His role as a teacher was "to help these people make an easier path. Make it a little bit simpler to walk along that path. Whatever path you happen to choose" (Z14.30). Zach began to believe that as a teacher, it was important for him to look back in order to help students move along the path. "And I have to start doing it more often because that's what a teacher is all about" (Z14.29).

Zach soon became aware that authoring good teaching stories was much more complex than the transmission of knowledge story he had previously constructed. As Zach tried to live a story of covering the prescribed curriculum, he soon became aware of the narrative contingencies which were part of the classroom story. He tried to overcome these narrative contingencies by being well planned. Planning helped Zach keep moving along the curriculum path because "you know what you're doing and things can't knock you off" (Z11.13/14). Having a script helped Zach "get to your goal. Your goal being your objectives. You want this and this done according to this method" (Z11.13/14) and prevented Zach from getting lost in classroom contingencies. His plans reminded him of what should be happening. "It's written down. This is the way it's supposed to be. Suddenly, you know what you're doing and things can't knock you off" (Z11.13). When something unexpected happened, he felt more comfortable dealing with it when he had his written plan to pull him back on course. "It made the things move smoothly today. Things were going the way I wanted them to go. Yes, there were minor problems here or there, but they were minor. Like they don't bother you when you know where you're going. You just quickly make a U turn around it and keep going" (Z11.9).

The speed with which he had to move along the path in order to cover the required curriculum ground was a continual frustration. "I watch my time, and I'm trying to keep up and there's so many things that I want to do and I just can't" (Z11.7). Zach saw his role of French teacher as one of teaching the vocabulary and grammar rules to students so that they would be able to make appropriate choices and put words together correctly. "There's rules. It's very logical, very sequential. You build on those rules. And then you start to take the rules apart and put things together in different ways, but you need the basic rules to start" (Z14.4). The French vocabulary they were learning would be useless if the students were not able to use it to communicate with each other. He wanted the students to have time to do group projects which would provide a more individualistic and creative focus to supplement the required curriculum.

Zach was often torn between the time students needed to do assignments well and the amount of material he wanted to cover. Zach needed students to pay attention in order to fulfil the curriculum requirements. As a teacher it was his position "to bring on this new information. That's my job, right. So, since that's my job and this is what's expected of me, I expect the students to have the respect to let me do my job. And if we do it quick enough, we'll have all this extra time so they can do what they want to do, right" (Z14.15/16).

Zach knew he would receive the initial respect of his students in his position as a male teacher. "I have the size, I have the deep voice and everything. I get that initial respect a lot easier than some people" (Z11.4). However, he also knew he would need to earn their respect through the relationships he was able to develop with them. "Now, it's a matter if I keep it or not" (Z11.4). Zach knew it would be up to him to prove he deserved that respect. He had the authority of position but needed to develop the authority of experience.

While Zach needed the students to listen to him in order to do his job of covering the curriculum, he also knew the relationships were what they would remember. "But, almost guaranteed, none of those students will remember what they were taught in that particular class. But they learned how to learn. They learned how to act as a human being, how to work in a social situation, how to be respected, how to give respect, and that's what they remember" (Z14.7). Tension mounted between his choice to live a story of teaching as covering the prescribed curriculum and being in control which conflicted with an implicit underlying story of valuing student voice and developing relationships with his students. He knew his job was to live a classroom story as a teacher. "Teaching takes precedence over being a friend. You're not there to be their buddy. You're there to do a job for them. That job is to teach them" (Z14.8).

Zach became more and more frustrated as he tried to cover the required curriculum so that he and his students could have time to fit in the group work he had planned. "My time is short. I'm on a deadline. I'm trying to get someplace very quickly in order to ensure that we have time to do some of these other things" (Z11.4). The students at times resisted following the curriculum version Zach was trying to author and tried to author their own. While Zach wanted to allow students individual freedom, he also needed to be able to pull them back together as a cohesive group. Tension mounted as Zach tried to make space for what he believed to be the explicitly valued curriculum and his implicit valuing of narrative connection. It was this tension that led to "the bubble breaking."

Zach had constructed a good teacher story of knowing enough and being in control. This story provided a "protective bubble" of certainty which would enable him to hide any of his weaknesses from his students and fit in as a good teacher. Being uncertain was not part of Zach's good teaching story of striving for perfection in knowing what he was doing and of being in control. As a teacher, Zach felt he should be able to predict what was going to happen so that problems could be avoided. "My first thoughts were that I failed. I let things go too far. I should have stopped things before they became a problem. I should have done things differently" (Journal entry, November 25, 1991).

Up until this time, Zach had storied himself as a person who could help others overcome their uncertainty. Sharing his uncertainty with others had not been a story which Zach had lived. "I'm just not used to that. Talking to people about stuff like that. Like this was a situation where I was not sure where I was headed. I don't like to be unsure. I especially do not like to advertise that I am not sure where I'm headed" (Z12.2). Zach was now beginning to see the possible value in sharing his uncertainty with others "because I talked to people, that all helped and now, I'm on a path again. I understand what's going on and I see where I want to go" (Z12.2).

Not only was there not enough time for Zach to fit in everything he wanted to accomplish with the whole class, but "each one has their own individual speed" (Z14.2). Many students were straining to move faster while others were struggling to keep up. Since there was a particular body of knowledge that Zach had to transmit to all students, this created a dilemma as Zach tried to accommodate the needs of all his students. "You can't have 30 different lectures in that class, because each student is actually progressing at a different pace. But it's not physically possible for me to lecture 30 different lectures to 30 different students because it takes 30 minutes to do a lecture, to teach a new concept" (Z14.2). Zach would need to teach at a pace which would fit the majority of his students. "You have to find that medium. And, with a class of more than five students, you have no

choice but to find a medium. You can't teach everyone everything according to their pace. It's just not possible" (Z14.2).

Zach experienced another tension when the students moved past the prescribed curriculum of standardized worksheets to doing more individualized projects. Many were attempting things far beyond what Zach or his cooperating teacher, Pat, had taught. "This is far beyond them. They don't even touch this stuff until Grade 10" (Z14.1). While Zach was pleased with the students' ability and initiative, he was also concerned when students moved into areas he had not yet reached in the curriculum. For Zach learning was a linear path "because it all builds on each other. If you don't know this, you can't do that" (Z14.1). Helping students involved teaching them to do things right so they could avoid the mistakes of others. "My problem is when they start getting into verbs, tenses and stuff that they don't understand. They're going to build bad habits if they do it wrong" (Z14.2). He felt strongly that allowing students to explore blindly on their own was miseducative. "You don't start doing something better if you keep doing it wrong. Maybe you learn to get worse at it. You have to be taught the right way" (Z14.5).

Zach knew it was up to him to make things happen during his practicum. He needed to learn to live the story he had so far only learned to tell. "Make it happen. Know all the theories, but all of that is just going to be background knowledge when you're up there. You are the one that's making things happen. Not the theories. You've got to call it as you see it" (Z12.5).

Before Zach could "make things happen," he needed to have a clear sense of what he wanted to happen within the context already set by the school. "I couldn't keep everything straight but now things are starting to fall into paths and I'm starting to see it" (Z11.6). As he began to understand how the existing school story was constructed and began to know what to expect, teaching became less problematic. "As I get more comfortable it's getting easier. The work is not getting any less, but it's becoming more rote memory, you're just doing it, making it happen. I have to think too much right now, but it'll become easier, so it won't take quite as long or it won't be quite as mind boggling or draining" (Z11.5). Having to think about too many things slowed Zach down on a path where he needed to move on quickly. Thinking took time away from doing.

Once Zach knew what he expected his students to accomplish he was better able to give clear instructions. Once they understood what he wanted, Zach encouraged them to make it happen in their own way. "It doesn't matter to me how they work as long as they work. Whatever works for them, make it happen. That's my new favorite line. I'm very very strict now. I've somehow become a bit of an ogre. These are my expectations, I lay them out and I lay them out just crystal clear. They know exactly what I expect" (Z13.4).

As Zach began to understand what was happening he was able to give his students more space in constructing the classroom story. When things were not going as Zach expected, he was able to step back and give his students the choice of what would happen next. He stopped teaching and waited to see what they would do. Zach imagined doing nothing worked because students do not like it when nothing is happening. He also told me that in this particular case, "I was controlling myself" (Z14.25) rather than attempting to control the students. "And then they were suddenly forced into a position where, what can I do to remedy this because life has stopped until I do something about this, and 'I' being the student. Not me, what's he going to do, because he's not doing anything" (Z14.25). Zach began to see he was not the only one responsible for making things happen in the classroom. "They wanted things to start happening. So, somehow, I was controlling the situation yet I wasn't controlling their response" (Z14.24).

The "Making it Rain" story Zach had lived during the teachers' professional development day left a lasting impression on him. Zach now began to restory the classroom as a social situation. "Because we are social beings, you need to have a rapport with everybody you come in contact with. And our jobs happen to be with students so we need a rapport with students. You can't be an isolated entity where you're not part of it. You're part of a situation. You're part of an environment, part of a community. You have to maintain that part" (Z14.10).

Zach also restoried what it meant for him to be a good teacher within the classroom community. "I'm finding less of a need to predict what's going to happen. And it's not bothering me as much" (Z14.26). However, Zach did not completely abandon his sense of being a controlling force "and it's just a balance and it's a very slight disbalance but that disbalance must be there and stay there in order to keep moving forward, in order to keep society humming smoothly along" (Z14.16). Zach continued to struggle with authoring a good teaching story of allowing students their individual freedom while at the same time "to have some type of authority in order to maintain that forward momentum" (Z14.18).

Interlude: Choosing a Direction

During this time I began to notice Zach's reference point shift. His instructors and text books had provided the points of reference which he trusted would tell him what he needed to know. Now I saw Zach becoming his own reference point as he began to connect what he was being told at the university to his own experience in a classroom. He chose to pay attention to teaching strategies which fit with his own narrative knowing of teaching, strategies which would help him deal with some of the tensions he had experienced in his practicum and author better teaching stories.

Zach was always looking for something new to try. He was required to keep a journal of his reflections and new teaching ideas. The journal was frustrating on days when Zach did not feel he had found a new idea. However, he agreed with the journal in principle because "my idea of teaching is always being something different so the kids are always 'Hey, what's going to happen today?' That's what I think a good teacher is" (Z16.27).

When Zach learned where his final practicum placement was to be he dropped in to say hello and make arrangements to visit Anne in her classroom as he had done with Pat. "I like to see things. I don't need to be overly prepared, but I don't like to walk in blind either. I need to have a rough idea, a rough picture of where I'm going" (Z16.7). He found himself able to read the timetable Anne gave him in a more informed way. "Now it's less confusing. Back then I didn't realize it could be confusing" (Z15.4). It was now useful in helping him begin to read the situation he would be fitting into.

He also knew he would need to fit into the narrative flow already established by Anne and her students. "It is her classroom. I'm simply stepping in for a short time and I can't tear apart what she's set up because it is her classroom and it's her rules, it's her little world and I'm going to come into her world. I'm not setting up my own world" (Z15.1). Zach valued getting experience from someone who had more experience than himself. "I don't have enough experience to know what's the best way so I'm trusting on somebody else's experience, the way they set it up and I'll try that out" (Z15.2). Because he would implement a unit plan which he was required to design for his university course during his practicum, he needed to find out contextual information from Anne. "Anne will be the best person to ask. I have to find out what these students do as a routine before I can make up a unit plan. Once I find that out I can begin to plan. After all, you can't teach something well until you know your audience" (January 21, 1992). Zach now knew teaching was an interaction between himself and his students. Understanding the context had become crucial to his planning. However, Zach realized while he had to "fit into the situation" (Z16.21), his presence in the classroom would change the situation "because it's a situation that maybe you haven't totally created but you've had a part in it" (Z16.21).

Zach also knew he would need to plan the unit to fit the required curriculum. "The curriculum that is set out, it's my basic foundation. I need to know what to teach. As well, you're legally obligated to do that. One of the rules again, right" (Z15.11/12). Knowing what to teach made his job easier. If he did not have to spend time deciding what to teach, he would have more time and energy to spend focusing on how to teach it. Zach planned to cover the knowledge presented in the text book, but how he actually proceeded was up to him. He would use some of the activities presented in the teacher's

guide book but also planned to construct some activities based on his narrative knowing. The activities in the guide might fit for the person who wrote them, but they may not necessarily fit for Zach "because that's me. When he's teaching it, maybe it's a whole different story. And I just have to go from there" (Z15.12).

Zach placed a high value on teaching students the skills they would need "because that's what they're going to take through their lives" (Z15.16). One of the skills he felt was an integral part of the Social Studies curriculum was the ability to communicate. "It is all entwined. Social, the word social means people. People communicate. Communication, English, same thing" (Z15.8). For knowledge to be useful, communication was essential. For Zach knowledge was not useful until it was translated into action. "You can know everything in the world, but you have to let somebody know you know it or make something happen with what you do know or what good is it? So you have to know how to communicate" (Z15.9).

Zach now saw himself placed in a matrix of choices that would affect the directions he chose. "You make choices which would make certain choices for you" (Z16.20/21). Some of these choices were made by himself which in turn limited future choices. "Because your background, everything, is making choices for you, you know. Helping you make that path. Helping you or hindering you from what you want to do. But it is still a direction" (Z16.20/21). In other ways, Zach's own choices were set within an interactive social context which placed his choices in relationship with others. In this sense, his choices were shaped by everyone and everything.

> Everybody does. Everything does. Your environment chooses the direction. Your past chooses your direction. The people around you choose the direction. The people above you, as in administration, choose a direction. Everybody, absolutely everybody has input. Your students, when you're teaching, your students choose a direction. Everybody has a little part in making those choices. In making your own choices which set choices for you. You have leeway, but the choices have been set. The outside lines are there. (Z16.21)

Zach began to story good teaching as an interactive relationship with his students. "You make your choices. You're automatically going to make some choices for them. They still have leeway. But everything you do is going to set a certain boundary for them whereas what they're doing is setting boundaries for you as well" (Z16.21).

Finale: Understanding the Situation

Zach described his first full day at the school as "comfortable" (February 10, 1992). He felt included by those who "welcomed me warmly into their midst, students

and teachers alike" (February 10, 1992). He could now read the situation through stories constructed from his personal practical knowledge of teaching. As he gained more teaching experience Zach described himself as "becoming better able to think on my feet" (Z19.5). He knew what he was doing. The situations Zach had already lived through provided ideas of what might work in new situations. "I've got this collection back here locked in my head of experience" (Z19.5). As Zach accumulated more experience he recognized similarities in new situations that reminded him of things that had worked in previous situations. He could use what he already knew to interpret and respond to new situations.

Zach began this practicum with some planning ideas already in mind based on his previous practicum experience. He had designed a format for lesson plans and day plans which were "tailored to meet my needs and I think they'll help to keep me more organized" (February 11, 1992). Zach put a lot of time and effort into his planning. Anne helped Zach learn to ask the kinds of questions which enabled him to predict better what might happen as the planned curriculum was lived in his classroom. He knew being well prepared would help keep him on course and avoid problems. "There's always going to be something that comes out of the ordinary. But if you plan it, the main framework, you're prepared and if you're prepared, you won't have problems" (Z21.4).

Anne's ability to draw Zach's ideas out by listening and questioning helped him expand and clarify his own knowing as he explained himself to her. While he initially expected more guidance from her, the more she created spaces for him to make his own choices, the more Zach began to take ownership of his own learning and of the classes he taught. "If you really sit back and look, yeah, she's doing it all. But she's letting me do it by myself at the same time so she's there. She's that helpful hand that's always there but you don't know she's there" (Z21.4). This relationship with Anne began to be storied in Zach's relationships with his students as he began to construct lessons which would enable his students to develop their own knowing rather than telling them what he felt they needed to know.

Zach became better able to structure activities which allowed more space for students to fit themselves in. Zach made space for the voices of his students within the curriculum in the technology assignment and was able to acknowledge his students as capable of creating appropriate questions. "They're happy and it really makes a difference because, I don't know, you're seeing things happening" (Z19.1).

The more opportunity Zach got to try new things, the better he liked it. Zach valued this practicum as a time to try things he thought would work for him. Because he would be accountable for the stories he authored as a teacher, these stories would need to fit with his

own personal practical knowledge of good teaching. He continued to assess his lessons and look for ways to improve his teaching. "There's no accepting. There's always a way to do it differently and better and you just have to always look back at what you've done and see how you could improve it" (Z22,16). As Zach focused on creating better ways of living his good teaching story he did not question the basic plot of this story. In order to fit in he needed to know he could live the good teaching story he believed everyone constructed of good teaching. For him, the choices were in how he would live the already authorized version.

As Zach began to believe he could teach he focused on different ways to accomplish his job. "I'm becoming less anxious about my skills. I'm not questioning can you do this? I can do this. I just have to decide how I'm going to do this, that's all I have to do. The questions change" (Z19.9). Zach began to accept that the lived classroom situation could not go exactly as planned and allowed himself to relax. He told me, "Not everything goes perfect in a classroom. But I think I'm coming to that acceptance and because I'm starting to accept it, I'm starting to worry less about being absolutely perfect" (Z19.9).

As Zach began to believe in his abilities to teach he was able to risk the uncertainty of trying something new as he moved along the path. "I don't stop. When I get used to something, I move on to the next thing that's brand new and so I'm just giving up one insecurity for another one" (Z21.2). Trying new things contributed to his growth and confidence as a teacher as he built his repertoire of skills through experience. "The more I give up, the more I've got behind me in my repertoire and so suddenly, the new ideas aren't totally new anymore because they're little parts of other things so I'm becoming more comfortable" (Z21.2).

By the time Zach had completed four weeks of his practicum, he began to see the classroom as his own. "It's my classroom. Because she's allowed me so much freedom" (Z21.3/4). Zach was gaining confidence in his ability to make his own choices in living a good teaching story. "There were still restrictions and there always will be but I was making many of the decisions that had to be made. I wasn't waiting for someone else to make them for me" (Z22.15).

As Zach began to see himself as an integral part of the classroom situation, he began to restory his role as the teacher. "You have to fit in, yes. But fitting in and manipulating are so close that after a little while it's hard to find that line and you have to do both" (Z19.14). Rather than needing to control students, he needed to "manipulate the situation" (Z19.14). Zach had learned to work with his students and gave them space to make their own narrative connections within the prescribed curriculum. He saw his role as leader differently. "I am ultimately responsible for what happens and if I am responsible, I

have to maintain some sense of I am leading this even though they're leading it, or they think they're leading it, I'm still leading it or how do you say, facilitating it in the right direction. I'm still in control and I have to maintain that control" (Z21.13).

Zach placed even more emphasis on having students interact with each other after his university callback session. Hearing about other student teachers' experiences helped Zach realize the importance of having time to interact with others in the same situation as yourself. This connected with the way Zach wanted students to interact in his classes. Using group work with his students was important to Zach "because it's Social Studies. And just the word by itself, social, means you have to do it more than one person. It's not a lone venture to find your way through. You do things together. Social means together" (Z19.10/11).

Drawing students into the group was important in Zach's image of fitting in. Zach began to realize drawing all the students into the group was not possible. "What's really sad is my dream is dying in the fact that I figure all students should be able to learn it because I can do it and I if I can do it I should be able to make them to do it and I can't and I'm realizing I can't" (Z19.3). When Zach had to make choices between attending to the group or individual students, he would choose the group "because you've got so many, you have to save as many as you can. You can't let the mass go for the one. You have to let the one go for the mass" (Z19.4).

Zach now described teaching as "one job" (Z21.1/2). What had been separate isolated tasks were now part of the whole. "I have to go and make library bookings and that so I can go to the library. But that's all part of the one job. Before it used to be a separate task. It's not a separate task anymore. It's just part of the daily routine and things are coming together" (Z21.1/2). Zach began to be able to read situations in a more holistic way as the separate pieces began to fit together. As his knowing of teaching became personal and holistic, it also became less problematic.

While Zach saw the value in remaining open,"it's impossible to constantly be open, because then you won't <u>do</u> anything" (Z16.25). Zach would need to make decisions in order to make things happen. Zach selected things which implicitly fit with his narrative knowing from the knowledge he had been given. He explained how a new idea became internalized "<u>because</u> it makes sense" (Z22.18). He described how it became part of his narrative knowing in the following way.

> Instant feedback. I've seen it done for me, heard about it being done, I've done it myself. I've thought about it. I like it. There's no question for me. I don't have to think is it right or wrong. It is right for me. It might not be right for somebody else, but for me it's right, so I don't think about it

> anymore. I just do it. Things like that have to become internalized. You cannot think about absolutely everything that you do. You have to do something so you have time to think about other things. Those are the choices you make. (Z22.18)

After both practicums were over, Zach told me, "I think I went in more not knowing what the heck I had to do. And being scared of that uncertainty" (Z22.15). While he had initially found his practicum experience "overwhelming," he was pleased when "all these little things at school are becoming everyday occurrences for me" (Z21.2). As teaching became part of Zach's personal practical knowledge it became less problematic as he became more accustomed to what to expect. Being able to predict gave Zach a sense of control. Once Zach understood, the way he would deal with routines would become a habitual part of his personal practical knowledge. "It's a waste of your time to think about it because that's the way it is. You do it. You become institutionalized in that matter. But, you'll only do that with things you agree with. But once you've accepted it, and you have no problem with it, you don't think about it any more" (Z22 17). This would enable Zach to "Move on" (Z22.17).

Zach's words from an earlier conversation echoed in my mind.

> The only way you can beat that is to go through the motions and attain that cultural capital, and then you can do it your way, but by that time, you're so engrained in the institutional way of doing things you're probably going to do exactly the same thing they've been doing. I don't know. I hope not. You can always hope. (Z4.15)

He had played the "believing game" (Elbow, 1981) well. In choosing to fit in he had learned to understand and believe in the system as well as in himself.

> There's a line there somewhere and every person draws their own line. School's not going to change. I've accepted that is the best way. If somebody comes up with a new way, I'll look at it but I'm not going to worry about it because I like the way it is. And I'm not going to waste my energy thinking about that. I'll conserve it there so I can use it here. It's choices. The teacher makes choices. That's all he does. He or she makes choices. He's faced with the hundreds of choices that he has to make and he makes them. (Z22.18)

Susan: Surviving the System

> When someone with the authority of a teacher, say, describes the world and you are not in it, there is a moment of psychic disequilibrium, as if you looked into a mirror and saw nothing.
>
> Adrienne Rich (cited in Bruner, 1990, p. 32)

Tied in Knots: Lost in the System

Susan entered her teacher education program knowing a story of good teaching as understanding and helping individual children. She expected that her program would focus on "seeing how they fit. Not how they fit the curriculum, how the curriculum will fit them" (S2.8). Susan soon found herself living a story of feeling expected to fit the curriculum of teacher education rather than having the curriculum of teacher education fit her narrative knowing. Her sense of feeling like a misfit was a reflection of the story she told of her brother as a special needs student. There were seldom connections as Susan tried to make sense of the materials with which she was presented. "Nothing fits. I have a puzzle. It's four different puzzles and I don't even have all the pieces" (S5.9).

She knew each person was an individual with his/her own unique experiences and needs. Susan hoped her university courses would provide her the opportunity to "really evaluate yourself carefully" (S1.10) and "get you to sort of think about who you are and why you are who you are. And how you are will affect your teaching" (S1.10). Susan also knew each person's perspective was different "and you have to be sensitive to the fact that your perspective is not everyone else's. They differ extremely from one to the other" (S2.10). Susan hoped to hear a variety of perspectives which she felt would increase her own knowing and illuminate some of her "biases" (S1.10). Susan appreciated having a variety of views asked for, listened to, and discussed. "I like hearing what other people have to say. . . . Maybe you're struggling to express your thoughts. And when they say it, you're like 'That's it! That's what I was trying to say'"(S1.9). Interaction through conversation could also help Susan "put on the brakes and think for a minute rather than just continuing on with what I was doing in my own merry way" (S6.23). She found little space for this to happen as she found her professors telling her what they felt she needed to know. She spoke of "telling" as a "one-sided conversation" (S6.23).

Susan often felt the connections she was making between the materials to be discussed and her own experience were seen as "off track" (S4.10) by her professors. "Are we going to memorize the article, or discuss what it means? And if we're going to discuss what it means, then isn't experience part of what it means? " (S4.10). Susan found little opportunity to construct her own meaning within her classes. "Hearing it repeated and discussing the meaning are two different things and we're not discussing the meaning" (S4.10).

While Susan valued group discussions in class, she worried that group assignments would not prepare her to develop her own authority as a good teacher. While Susan could see benefits to working with others "because in a group, you have someone else to say, 'Hey, what do you think of this?' or 'What about this?'" (S7.2), at the same

time the group assignments did not give her the confidence to rely on herself and her own authority as a teacher. "You need to have a balance because otherwise you get feeling like I do in that you're dependent on someone else always to help you with your work. Well, I'm not probably going to have that someone else every time I make up a lesson" (S7.2).

Susan had hoped to gain a variety of perspectives from her courses which she would then be able to integrate into a broader perspective. Instead she found "a lot of classes that are completely disjointed from one another" (S2.6/7). This sense of disconnection continued as Susan struggled throughout her program to construct connections between the conflicting information with which she was presented and her own narrative knowing of education. For example, Susan knew "within each classroom there's going to be kids that are slow and kids that pick up really quickly" (S2.7). She wanted to know "why and what to do about it and we're not getting that at all" (S2.7). She had expected to learn how to adapt the curriculum to the individual needs of each student. "Now it's like I've started all over and they're saying 'that's important, but here's what we're doing now.' I'm saying 'But isn't it all the same thing?'" (S2.8).

Susan felt fragmented when she could not find herself in the theories which seemed to contradict each other and her own narrative knowing. She doubted the professional knowledge she was being presented which was disconnected from her narrative knowing of good teaching. When Susan could not make connections with the stories she was being presented, she felt like a misfit. Asking questions did not seem to be acknowledged as an authorized version of constructing knowledge. "If I ask a question, it's a neutral comment, remark, or an ignored remark, or we'll address that later" (S5.7/8). Susan could not trust in the authority of her own experience when she could not find confirmation for the stories she was trying to construct. While she felt "ready to form my own conclusions, to make my own predictions, to be responsible to know what I would want to know" (S6.5), she felt "like no one's saying that you do know what you want to look for" (S6.5). She felt uncertain, confused, and angry that she was not receiving the education she thought she would need to become a good teacher nor was she authorized to construct knowledge of teaching which fit her narrative knowing. She felt required to silence herself and to live a story of covering the curriculum.

Susan soon felt lost in a system in which she felt required to set aside her personal practical knowledge and to conform to what she believed her professors thought was best. Her personal practical knowledge seemed of no account in her teacher education program. Susan was frustrated when there was no attention paid to uncovering the process of how she came to know what she did. "I feel like I need to relearn the procedure and think about how I learned it to know it in the first place to be able to pass it on" (S2.20). Susan

wanted to spend time uncovering the knowledge she knew she now took for granted; however, "they're counting on the fact that you know all this stuff so we don't have to discuss it. It's become so automatic that I don't know it anymore. And I don't know how I would teach it" (S2.15/16).

She sensed there was a secret body of certain professional knowledge which was being withheld from her. "It seems to me my profs feel there's a right answer. Some of the students feel there is a right answer. They're just not letting me in on it (laugh)" (S2.17). Susan asked questions in order to gain access to this knowledge and to make her own connections. "I think you have to question something first, and think about everything, and then you'll sort of come to terms with whether you know it or not" (S2.19). At times she felt her questions were seen as interruptions to the planned flow of a systematic class. "It's almost like they're impatient. 'We just did it and this is the way you do it so why are you questioning my method?'" (S3.15). At times she felt her questions were heard as a threat to the authority of position her professors seemed to hold. "Everyone seems really sensitive to the fact that why are you questioning my knowledge? I'm not questioning you personally, I'm just questioning period" (S4.9).

Susan described choice as "something that I value" (S5.8). Making her own choices allowed Susan to feel both responsible and accountable for herself and the choices she made. Susan found there was little choice open to her to author her own stories within her teacher education courses. Susan struggled with assignments that left little space for her to address issues she found relevant to becoming a good teacher.

> It's almost like you're following a hidden agenda, and it's not your own. Like I'm not going to paint out that the system is great and everyone is environmentally aware and teachers are really morally upstanding citizens and this is a social value so they should push it in the school system. I don't buy that. That's a rosy picture. That's not reality. And I don't like having to read references that are not of my choosing that are really slanted and I thought a lot of them were. (S3.9)

However, because her professors had the authority to evaluate her papers and exams, she also needed to know what each one's expectations were. "I think I write what I want to write but I also know what, it goes back to expectations again. What does this professor like? What does he hate?" (S5.13).

Having little choice in constructing assignments to help her address issues she found problematic left her feeling helpless to develop her competence in making responsible choices once she began teaching. "I don't feel like I have any control over what's happening. And I don't feel like what's happening is doing me a lot of good. So

it's certainly not doing anything for my attitude which has gone from bad to worse. I think in a classroom I would have more choice. But I don't feel competent to go into a classroom so that's putting you into a spot again of what choice do I have?" (S5.9).

Susan was often beside herself as she felt compelled to author stories of teaching she herself could not make sense of until she had questioned them. As she tried to live the story she felt was expected of her, she felt alienated from both the knowledge she supposed she should have received as well as from her narrative knowing of the caring relationships involved in good teaching. The decontextualized information she had received in her coursework had not prepared her to know how to relate to a particular child. When she found herself sitting with a child in an assessment situation, "I felt like I didn't know, I was sitting with an alien" (S6.6). The words that came naturally to her were not part of the "script" in the testing manual. Susan was torn between following the script in the manual and relating to the child in front of her. The disembodied voice from the standardized wording of the assessment form that Susan felt compelled to use left her feeling alienated from her own voice, her knowing, and her ability to develop a relationship with John, the little boy in front of her. "I felt like I was looking at this script, thinking back to my university, what am I supposed to say? It was so unnatural. I felt really unnatural with this kid and I thought picture yourself now in front of 30 of these little guys and I just about started sweating right on the spot. I thought I think I'll snap" (S6.6). Susan could not find the interconnectedness she sought. Susan needed to make connections through experience in order for the professional knowledge with which she was presented to become part of her personal practical knowledge.

The personal, holistic, problematic way in which she approached her coursework was at odds with her sense that she should be progressing toward the certain knowledge she felt would be required of her as a professional teacher. She continually questioned the paradigmatic versions she was being presented to try to get at underlying issues. By exploring underlying issues, Susan felt it would be possible to "see what's really going on" (S3.12) and to imagine ways to change present stories and to construct better ones.

Susan was continually frustrated as she tried to construct new stories of teaching and teacher education. Susan seldom considered the already authorized versions to be examples of the stories she was trying to construct. She was afraid she would become "the 'safe teacher,' the one that follows the way it's always been done" (S2.18). Alternate possibilities did not seem to be encouraged. She felt discouraged by others who insisted on living a story of security. "And it seems like that's what they're teaching us. . . . Pick a safe lesson plan, pick a safe subject. . . . Pick something you know about" (S2.18). Susan saw little space or support for the risks involved in exploring new possibilities. For

Susan, the authorized story provided only the false security of covering up what she did not know and left her feeling like an imposter. She could not author her own stories until she could discover and make sense of the basic ingredients of good teaching that she could integrate with her narrative knowledge of good teaching. Susan wanted to receive the basics to enable her to construct stories of her own. "I don't want a recipe. It would be lovely to have one. . . . But at least if I had a standard recipe and then create my own from here. Here's the basic ingredients and this is how they connect. I don't feel like I'm getting basic ingredients. I feel like I've been turned loose in Super Store and told to 'Make something that is good'" (S2.17).

Susan experienced a tension between the certainty she wanted to have to feel confident as a teacher and the desire to question and uncover the knowledge with which she was presented. "I'm finding it a real crash course in something that I really don't have any perception of yet" (S2.6/7). Susan became more concerned as she became aware of how complex teaching is. She felt her courses were raising her awareness, but not providing her with the "background knowledge" (S1.6) she needed. Susan began to realize what she considered to be the professional knowledge of the teacher as expert was fraught with dilemmas and ambiguities she had never imagined during the first two years of her program. Each problem she had previously imagined seemed to lead to more problems rather than solutions. Being awakened to issues without having any ideas how to handle them frightened Susan as she searched for answers and found only more questions. Instead of coming closer, her hope of learning to live the good teaching story of teacher as expert seemed to recede further into the distance. Her own questions led to more questions and uncertainty while she felt she would be expected to have the answers if she were not to be an imposter in the classroom. "If I know what I'm doing and I know my area well, I'm a confident person. But I can't see how they're expecting everyone to be confident in something they know nothing about. Yet they're not providing me with the information that's going to give me the confidence that I will need" (S2.10).

Covering the curriculum did not allow Susan the time she really needed to think about and question underlying issues she became aware of throughout her program. "I think that when it comes to teaching you obviously want to look at it as positively as you can or you'd be miserable all the time, but is it realistic to say that what we always do and what we've done in the past has been great?" (S3.13).

Susan needed to develop confidence in the authority of her own experience. She had expected to receive the training to enable her to do so. Her courses which were disconnected from practice felt "so artificial" (S2.12). Decontextualized theories left Susan feeling she had only half of the story. "We're getting all the 'should' and 'why you

should' and 'it's better for the learner' and it's, you know, but the how is lacking there" (S6.3). Susan's emphasis on learning how was an expression of her need for the practical experience that would help her bring her own sense to the theory. She could not imagine the personal relationships in a situation she had not experienced. "I try to visualize every lesson that I do as being presented to my class. And I try to think of ideas that I could do in my classroom that would make my learning fun, make my students enjoy what they're doing. But I'm not, I can't see that. Some days I can and some days I think Woah!" (S6.3/4).

In order to be a good teacher, Susan felt she would need to know what she was doing. "If I'm going in there expecting that I'm going to know half about what I'm doing, how is this going to work?" (S2.2). Susan felt she was being left to figure this out on her own. "We're just sort of learning everything all at once and it's all running together and it's not running together and you're trying to make the connection but there is no connection sometimes. You're sort of left" (S2.13). Susan needed to experience the process to make sense of what she was learning. She did find connections through activities where "we did it ourselves. Did it in partners just like it was suggested. Shared our ideas in the class and we went through the process ourselves. So it really got you thinking well, yes I agree, maybe I'd do that a little different. From my experience in doing it I felt this way and in order for my students to feel better about that I would maybe change this. It really gave you something to work with" (S3.14/15). In order to be prepared to teach Susan wanted as much training as possible "so I have something to work with once I get there" (S2.4).

Susan had expected to receive enough training to feel competent and confident to make professional choices and author her own good teaching stories. "I feel like I'm going to have so much work to do when I'm finished this. I'm going to know where the resources are and how to use them, but that's it. From there it's going to be trial and error and if it works it works and if not you're relying on yourself. And that's it" (S2.16). Susan was terrified she would not know enough to be able to make the choices she would be responsible for within the classroom. She was angry she had not been provided opportunities within her program to gain the practice she felt she needed to be able to rely on herself to make competent choices. "I had expected to go through four years of university training coming out being a trained professional and I won't be a trained professional. I'll be an amateur, you know. An apprentice really" (S6.1).

Tying and Untying: Caught in the System

Susan knew as a good teacher she would need to rely on herself. However, she was overwhelmed by what she felt she would need to know in order to become a good teacher. "It looks like a pretty easy job. And then you start finding out. Oh, but there's more behind this than you see" (S8.9). As she began to realize what would be expected of her as a teacher, her sense of inadequacy increased. "I find these last two years so overwhelming. I'm getting great marks. I'm getting better marks than I had expected but I don't think that I'm having the process time" (S8.9/10). Because she believed she would need to acquire enough knowledge to gain the certainty necessary to be a good teacher, she again questioned the way her program had been set up. "Why wait until your last year and a half to cram all of this instruction into it?" (S8.9).

Susan continued to experience a tension between believing there was a right way to do things which she did not yet understand and knowing she had to find a way which fit her personal practical knowing. Susan found what she had learned from one professor was storied differently by another professor yet each seemed to assume their story was the right one. "I found that every class has sort of expected that you've taken it somewhere but every professor has a different idea of what his expectations for a lesson plan are. And I can't find that out from another class. I have to find it out from him" (S8.3). However, Susan felt, since each professor seemed to have different expectations about what lesson planning was, "it would almost be better for them to show you all these styles. And then you can look at that professor and evaluate his teaching, if it worked for you. If this lesson plan makes sense to you, would you use it? Then you have a repertoire of skills at least rather than is there one right way to do it" (S8.3). Susan continued to feel fragmented as she moved from class to class. "I'm trying to think of more creative ways, but, Oop, class is over. On to the next one. And then it's different again" (S8.12).

While Susan felt she had received a lot of information, she needed to use it herself in order to make sense of what she knew. "Well I seem to be chomping at the bit to at least get into a school and figure out 'Ha, I don't know close to what I thought I knew,' or 'Gee, I know a lot more than I ever thought I did.'" (S8.12). Without the opportunity to incorporate the new ideas she had learned into her personal practical knowledge, Susan worried she would teach the way she had been taught. "I agree with you and I've agreed with you for the past two years and then I'm going to get out there and think I don't know what I'm doing, I'm going back to the textbook and the worksheet thank you" (S11.19). Her one visit to a classroom helped her realize she did know something about relating to students. "It was like, it came to me automatically, I was like Woah, I do know some of this now" (S 12.6).

Susan experienced a continual struggle between what she called "going with the flow" (S10.25), or trying to live the authorized story, and resisting the authorized story to explore the stories lived by herself and others she knew. During a panel discussion on integration of special needs students Susan spoke up about her concerns for the individuals involved. Susan expressed her concern about the need for being trained in order to be able to make changes. "I don't think the solution is to try and change it there and then change our training program. I think it should start here" (S9.2). While Susan had taken five courses in Special Education, she felt ill prepared since the courses seemed "irrelevant in how to teach children. They don't tell you what to teach. Or how to do it" (S9.2). She was angry when system policies were implemented that seemed to ignore the personal practical knowledge of the individuals involved in implementing those policies. "It is legislated. That doesn't get rid of the emotions involved. There is still fear.. . . You're on the defensive right away. . . . I think that's a very important emotion involved in this whole thing. Fear of the unknown and fear of not knowing what you're doing'" (S9.3). When Susan voiced her concerns, everyone applauded.

Later, when members of a Special Education panel told Susan they were impressed with her questions and comments, she was amazed. Having her ideas confirmed by those in authority made her wonder why they were not speaking up themselves. "It drives me crazy. Some of those people that I talked to at that panel were really nice people and they were caught in the system and they're saying 'I respect that you could stand up and say what you said.' But I'm thinking 'Why couldn't you stand up and say what I said?'" (S10.30). Susan was furious when the people she felt were in positions of authority that would be listened to were unwilling to speak up on behalf of individuals.

Susan could not find confirmation of her images of good teaching from her friends. When she spoke up she began to realize how strong their images of teaching and learning were. Rather than supporting Susan in her views of trying to imagine a better education system for children, she was seen as "idealistic" (S11.29). Susan had heard this comment from others many times before and it annoyed her. "I'm going to either be idealistic or throw my hands up in the air and say it won't make a difference anyways so who cares" (S11.29).

In her story of good teaching, Susan wanted to be able to help her students think for themselves, something she felt she had "missed out on" (S10.19) during her own schooling. She valued thinking skills which could enable herself and her students to make responsible choices. Susan was often disappointed in the time allowed for thinking about teaching and learning within her classes. "They automatically think you should know how to do that. Well you're not being a teacher then are you. You're transmitting all this. And

what is your job and what are you supposed to be training me to do?" (S10.20). In order to make appropriate choices as a teacher, Susan needed to think about and question what might be learned through particular activities. Susan found herself living a story of covering the curriculum as she could "go through all these activities and not even think about them. Which is what everyone in our group seems to do. Quick get it done and talk about whatever. But I said 'What do you think would be learned by this activity?', then I start thinking, well if I couldn't explain what I think they're going to learn, then what would be the point?" (S10.4). Susan became frustrated with other students who seemed not to be thinking about what they were doing. "Like people, you're going to be teaching. You should be thinking. If you want to teach thinking, you better be able to do it yourself" (S11.15).

While Susan wanted to be exposed to and have time to think about other strategies, she felt she had acquired a list of meaningless facts. She did not want this to be the way she learned how to teach. "To me, the fact is not as important as being able to figure out the fact. So if I'm able to memorize ten things, that's not as important as being given ten new things now and putting some rhyme and reason to them. That's thinking. That's not memorization and it's not transmission of knowledge" (S13.20).

Susan found few examples of respect for individuals at university. "It wears you. It wears you thin. That's what I find. I get really stressed. I start feeling really bad when I feel like people don't show me any respect" (S11.8). Susan was also frustrated by the lack of emphasis on personal relationships both within her courses and among the people with whom she came in contact. "Little things" (S11.9) did not seem to be valued, "like going and doing something for someone and not hearing a 'thank you' or a 'please' or just very basic fundamental respectful things. Consideration maybe is a better word. I think they go hand in hand. If you're considerate, you're usually respectful toward people" (S11.9). Objective knowledge seemed to be more important than human relationships. "I think that if more people treated people like people you wouldn't have as many problems as you do. And I don't just mean in the school system. I mean everywhere" (S10.24).

The theories, categories, labels, and strategies Susan was learning in her program left little space for talking about people. Objectified knowledge about children seemed to lead to objectifying the children themselves. Susan felt it was crucial to see her students as people first. "But yet in school, we forget that. These are not people, they are Johnnie, my student" (S10.16).

Susan's visit to a Special Education classroom reaffirmed her belief in needing to contextualize what she was learning. "What I saw in that classroom I'll remember for a long time" (S12.13). The visit also made Susan aware of the emotional impact of

teaching. "Like my first reaction was an emotional one. I felt sad. I felt like I was going to start crying just seeing these kids . . . just the initial reaction" (S12.13).

As Susan watched the activities in the classroom, she described the children as needing "so much individual attention" (S12.8). She soon found a tension between the curriculum planned by the teacher and the individual needs of the students. When one of the students was left behind, Susan worked individually with him and was able to give him the support he needed to continue with what for him was a difficult task. "But you see there was no attention to that. It was let's finish it and let's move on. But to me you're not improving if you're not concentrating, if you're worried about keeping up, if you're worried about getting on so you can do the next thing" (S12.20).

Susan herself felt "like an idiot" (S13.8) when she got left behind in the process during an art lesson. Susan imagined the process to be "a step towards a product and if you get discouraged too quickly then you don't care about the product and you don't enjoy the process" (S13.8). Her image of good teaching as helping each student understand the process was not happening for her as a student. As a good teacher Susan wanted to help her students achieve their own goals. Susan saw her teaching role as "giving you the moral support that you need to allow you to continue. . . . And to help you deal with the failure that you have just experienced. That's life" (S13.7).

The story of good teaching Susan felt expected to author was "have it clear in your head, from the onstart, that this is what you want them to learn" (S8.4). This story was in tension with her story of good teaching as constructing lessons to fit the needs of each child. She had learned that lessons were to be planned, taught, and evaluated. "And that was like with those scripted lesson plans that I was doing. And a lot of the books, the literature I am reading is saying you should have a mental script" (S8.7). Susan could not imagine a way to evaluate her teaching or her students' progress unless she had specific expectations in mind ahead of time. "Unless you had a clear expectation in your mind, I don't see how you could reflect back and see if it was successful or not" (S8.4). At the same time Susan could "see so many contradictions" (S8.7). She knew if she had specific goals for the lesson "then I have a hidden agenda to my lesson, right. I'm asking this question and the kids who catch on to my style of teaching are going to go 'Oh, she wants this answer'" (S8.7). This was "going on the other side of what I've read to say if you are expecting an answer then your kids will catch on very quickly how to please <u>you</u>, not how to <u>learn</u>. How to please you with their responses" (S8.7).

Susan worried that if she allowed students to express their individual interests, "I don't know if I'll have the skill to get in there and do it this way without having it go 50 directions and then turn around at the end of the day and say, if I'm going to keep a job

and I'm going to keep my sanity, I better get some organization happening here because now I have 50 other potential lessons and where do I go?" (S8.7/8).

Off and Running: Surviving the System

As Susan's practicum approached, she was worried she did not feel educated. When I asked Susan what she thought being educated would feel like, she replied, "Confident. I would feel more confident anyway. I wouldn't feel like I knew everything, but I would feel like I knew something. A place to start anyways and I don't feel like I know much" (S14.13).

The story she felt was authored for her was one of learning the theories first and then putting them into practice. This did not fit her story of learning through experience. Susan had expected her training to take place at the university and felt "utterly and totally cheated by the system" (S14.12). She knew she would need to know what she was doing in order to be seen as a good teacher during her practicum. She doubted she could bring to life the theories she had learned. "If I would have been able to do it and put it into practice it would be a memory to me. Now it's not a memory, it's a page on a book. Its print on a page in a book and that's all it is -- dead" (S14.9/10). Susan wished she "could have at least had someone coaching me through all this theory, thinking, you know, because it did feel like a lot of the things I was reading were good. But there was something missing" (S14.17). She did not imagine her practicum as the place where this coaching would happen.

As a student teacher Susan felt "caught in the middle" (S17.7) of multiple contexts with different and often conflicting implicit agendas. "The university has a separate agenda and my school has a separate agenda" (S17.3). If she was going to be storied as a good teacher by her cooperating teachers, she would need to play a different role for each one. Being storied as a good teacher by her university teachers was a different story again. As a student teacher, Susan was accountable for authoring good teaching stories for her students. At the same time she was a character who needed to fit into the good teaching stories authored by her cooperating teachers and her two university instructors. Parents, support staff, school administrators, other teachers, children, and social workers would also construct Susan as a character in their stories. Within this multiplicity of contexts, stories, characters, and authors Susan hoped to develop a sense of her own authority as a good teacher.

Susan was looking forward to the half an hour a day set aside from teaching to provide time for student teachers to keep a reflective journal and discuss teaching practice with each other. While Susan felt keeping a journal was "sort of a lot to ask in addition to

all these things" (S15.2), she believed her university instructors "want it for your personal and professional development which is good because now they're treating you as a person and not just a student or a teacher" (S15.2).

At the beginning of her practicum Susan found it "nice to have that half hour where you can sit by yourself or chat with someone while you're writing about what's going on" (S18.1). Susan soon found the value placed on reflection by university instructors was not part of the elementary school story. Susan described going "into the situation and they were happy with my style and things like that, apparently, because they increased my teaching load'" (S17.3). It did not take long for Susan to describe herself as on "the treadmill" (S17.3). Susan was overwhelmed by the number of things she felt compelled to do in the limited time available. The school story seemed one of covering rather than understanding. "What you end up falling into is, I can't get all this covered so I'll just tell it and it's a very easy thing to slip into when you're under time constraints like that. But that doesn't mean that they're learning it. That just means that you're covering it and there's a difference between teaching something and covering it" (S17.4). At the university "they were bragging about this reflection thing. I'm not getting any time and this week I'm supposed to be teaching full time. When do I get time then?" (S17.3). Susan soon learned the school story of thinking on her feet.

Susan also wanted her students to tell stories of her as a real teacher. Susan realized "real" teachers did not have or take the opportunity to step back to reflect on their practice. One aspect of becoming a real teacher for Susan meant being with her students. "It really breaks up the afternoon if you leave for half an hour and the kids really are perceptive and they pick up on that, gee, how come she leaves for half an hour every day? She's not the 'real' teacher" (S18.1). Susan also wanted to "learn it by experience in the classroom" (S18.4). She valued getting experience from those she felt were more experienced than herself. "And my teachers, for the most part, have been ones that I could talk to and say . . . could you explain why you did that? Or why you do this in your classroom? Not to say that I have to agree with you but at least now I have something more concrete to say about it" (S18.4).

Susan soon found she had moved from one institutional narrative to another. Neither seemed to have a place for the stories of individual people. In the university Susan had found no place for individual's stories in the depersonalized world of objective decontextualized theories. In the school she saw policies and procedures covering over individual's concerns. Susan's stories were filled with individual children she saw as lost in the system. Susan focused particularly on Kathy and Douglas during her time in regular classrooms.

While Susan felt good about helping Kathy, she could not understand why no one had done so before. "It scares me because I don't know how she can be so lost in this system. She's in Grade 4 already and she's not even in a resource setting where she's getting this extra, she's only getting this extra time because I'm there" (S16.2). Douglas as well had been "assessed, last year in March" (S16.3) but he was still "on a waiting list for speech therapy because he has no speech" (S16.3). At present nothing seemed to be happening with Douglas. Susan saw little connection between the test results, the referral, and the lack of effort to help Douglas.

Donna, the cooperating teacher, had paid little attention to Douglas because she had "23 students and he's so time consuming'" (S16.7). Susan's focus was different. "The way I look at it is 85% of the kids in this class come from supportive families. . . . Those are kids that will survive the school system and this is a kid that won't for sure. His chances two weeks ago were zero and they're slowly working up. . . . The focus and the thinking needs to be done about this kid. He's the one that needs it the most" (S16.7).

When Kathy confided she was being sexually abused by her mother's boyfriend, Susan told her cooperating teacher and principal. The matter was taken out of her hands, proper procedures were followed and Kathy, along with Douglas, were swept away, removed from their home and school "because they're the problem . . . and Kathy was very close to her mom so I'm sure that that's very painful for her" (S18.11). Susan wondered what Kathy had learned from this situation. "If it happens again and you're in that situation, would you come forward? In a kid's eyes, maybe it's better to tolerate the abuse than to have to deal with what happens when I report it which is really what I think we are teaching them" (S18.11).

While Susan had tried to provide opportunities for Kathy and Douglas to author new stories of respect, success, and belonging, she felt defeated, angry, and hurt by policies and procedures that seemed to cover over individual circumstances. However, Susan would not choose to give up trying. "That's a cop out. Ok, sit back and don't try. That's better, right? That way you don't get involved, you don't get hurt and life just goes on. Great. That's why we're having the problems we are is because too many people have that attitude" (S18.11). Susan was determined to find ways to be heard within the system.

Susan not only needed to consider what she felt was best for her students, but at the same time needed to pay attention to what she believed her evaluators were looking for as well. While Susan valued having her students learn through group activities, she also needed to construct lessons which her cooperating teacher and university teacher saw as good teaching. Susan wanted to use group work in a lesson but was concerned because

her university teacher was coming in to observe and evaluate her teaching. "He's coming in and I hate working in group activities with these kids because they're so used to seatwork that the management just goes crazy. I'd like to do something a little more, like last time I did a full group activity. I know what he's like and I just, I don't know, it's just this impression you want to leave on this guy. He's evaluating me" (S16.12). Susan had decided to stick with her beliefs of what was good for children and create a group activity. "They all conferenced and I walked around and conferenced with them in groups of two and then stopped the class and had someone share what they've written so far because they were all really excited to share their stories" (S17.1). Susan was pleased with what the children were learning. When the lesson was over, she asked her evaluator, "'What did you think of what you observed today?' He said, 'Well I really didn't see you doing anything.' I was so mad. Ok. Managing twelve groups of two doesn't really mean anything?" (S17.2/3). As well as trying to construct good teaching stories which would also be seen as valuable by others, Susan was "trying to learn how to deal with all the emotions that you feel every single day. It's very draining. Very draining" (S17.7).

Susan found her professor in her callback class "very positive" (S16.15). Having input into how the class would be structured gave Susan the opportunity she needed to feel responsible for her own learning. "We all wrote down suggestions. . . . Really good stuff and really it's been get into your groups and talk about what's going on and get up and go to a different group and talk about what's going on and to me, that's such a breath of fresh air again because yes, I am responsible, yes, this is my career" (S16.15).

Susan enjoyed working with the children in the Special Education class during the second half of her placement. Part of this came from feeling "a lot more confident in my abilities than I did in September" (S18.16). Susan also felt better prepared to teach a Special Education class. "I've had two workshops . . . and Linda's using the same program that [my university professor] was teaching so I'm pretty confident in that" (S18.16). Susan also felt less fragmented. "I'm not split between two teachers and I have a set routine and the routine is very flexible but it's the same every day. I know what to expect when I go in" (S18.16). Susan found she fit in with Linda's "philosophy and everything else and it's very easy to stick to for me. The routine and the structure is just crucial to these kids" (S18.18/19).

Because meeting the individual needs of her students was important, Susan "got a lot more stressed out [in the regular classrooms] just knowing that you're not meeting the needs of all your kids where in this [the Special Education] classroom, it's realistic that I can only meet this many needs, but there's five or six of them so I can do it really well" (S18.18). Susan could imagine individualized instruction working with a small class of

children. However, meeting individual needs was impossible in Monica's combined 4/5 classroom. "When you have 24 students and within Grade 4 you have such a range of abilities, and now you throw in Grade 5 and another range of abilities, it's too much for one person to cope with" (S16.9).

In regular classrooms, Susan had felt pressured to cover the curriculum. "This is what I have to cover and if I don't have it covered, then I'm really behind because tomorrow I have more to cover" (S18.18). In the Special Education class, there was not the same pressure. "Academics are very important, but if the behavior gets out of control, no one's going to stand on my neck and say 'Gee, the curriculum wasn't covered this year Susan.' And I really felt that pressure in that [regular] classroom" (S18.17).

Susan was surprised that when she began to consider the individual needs of students, she paid more attention to the curriculum than she had in the regular classroom. "I look at the curriculum a lot more. Mike is in Year 5 in school. He should be at this level. He should be doing these things. So maybe he can't do them at the Grade 5 level, but at least I can expose him to these Grade 5 activities at his own level so I find that I use that a lot more. In Monica's Grade 4/5 class I didn't even use the curriculum. Workbook, this book. Like they're teaching from the text book and that was very much the way she did things" (S18.17).

For Susan being a good teacher involved helping students learn "how to make choices, how to deal with people, how to deal with your own problems, thinking about alternative ways to solve your problems, and how to take responsibility for your actions" (S18.15). Trying to live this story of good teaching was "much harder than I ever imagined and I thought that I'd prepared myself for hard work" (S17.7). Trying to live her good teaching story in an institutional context where individual's stories seemed invisible and unheard often left Susan feeling helpless and enraged. At this point Susan felt "that I have to lighten up a bit, like obviously I'm pretty negative right now. . . . I'm going to put my time and energy into it, try to give it a good two years, maybe three, but I honestly think that I won't be able to survive in this system just because it's too hard. It's too emotionally hard" (S17.10).

Conclusion

Both Zach and Susan used their personal practical knowledge to shape the meanings they constructed and reconstructed of teaching and learning. However, the lack of opportunity to inquire into their personal practical knowledge and value this as a legitimate way to inquire into their practice, did not provide opportunities for them to

reflect on their implicit understandings of teaching and learning. Focusing on the body of professional knowledge they felt expected to acquire turned their attention away from their personal practical knowledge. Attention was not paid to the ways in which they selected professional knowledge to incorporate into their own narrative constructions. Because their personal practical knowledge seemed of no account within their teacher education programs, they learned to discount it as irrelevant. While they felt compelled to ignore their personal practical knowledge, what they paid attention to and the ways in which they paid attention in their programs was implicitly shaped by this knowledge. Thus, as they learned both to cover up as well as to not uncover their personal practical knowledge, their implicit assumptions of good teaching were never brought into question. Although they knew each professor and cooperating teacher constructed good teaching differently, they were not able to acknowledge their own images of good teaching as their individual constructions. In order to author their lives as teachers, they needed to be awake to the narrative plot lines they used to construct and reconstruct their stories as well as to read the stories being constructed by others. As they paid attention to learning to read the plot lines they felt were being constructed for them as students by their professors and cooperating teachers, they did not pay attention to learning to read the plot lines they themselves were constructing.

They each lived a story of striving for perfection embedded within the sacred story of technical rationalism. If they could learn the right way and practice it enough, they could become the good teachers they wanted to be. The surprise necessary to awaken to new possible ways to story educative experience posed a continual threat to Zach and Susan as they tried to learn to live the story of objective certainty they knew would be required of them as good teachers. Being evaluated as potential good teachers by others throughout their programs did not leave them the time or space to question and reconstruct their knowledge as they lived a story of covering the required curriculum and presenting what they knew both in their university assignments and in their practica.

By sharing my story of how Zach and Susan came to know what counts in their teacher education programs, I have shown how curriculum is mediated through the personal practical knowledge of the individuals involved. Until we pay more attention to the personal practical knowledge of the individual people involved in teacher education, restructuring programs will continue to make little difference in teacher education.

CHAPTER SEVEN

> Life is worth living. Not because there is nothing else, but because of what we each may give one another; pain, joy, anguish, peace. It's not an easy journey. You may even call it an adventure. It doesn't matter about the problems, the contradictions. In our hearts we understand everything. We understand it's the struggle that counts.
>
> (Ann Oakley, 1992, p. 204)

A REFLECTIVE RETURN: CONTINUING THE INQUIRY

Through this inquiry, Zach's and Susan's stories of experience in teacher education have mingled with mine, leading me to new understandings of teaching and teacher education. For me this inquiry has also raised questions about present practices in teacher education. In this chapter I reflect on what sense I make of the stories Zach, Susan, and I have constructed, I reflect on narrative inquiry as a research methodology, and I imagine future program and research possibilities for teacher education.

In the first section I explore the stories constructed in the present inquiry. I then move to possibilities for restorying teacher education programs. In these two sections I focus on the implicit authority in sacred stories, on integrating personal and professional authority, and on the sources of tensions involved in staying awake to educative experience. I then reflect on the use of narrative inquiry as a research methodology. In the final section I focus on new research possibilities in teacher education.

Narrative Authority in Teacher Education

At the university Zach, Susan, and I attend, many stories are told of reflective practice. Through working with Zach and Susan, I have come to realize the stories we tell as teacher educators in a program constructed around reflective practice are often not the stories the students experience us living out in our practices as teacher educators within the institutional contexts of university classrooms and school classrooms. It is this disjuncture that I explore in this section. I see the disjuncture, the lack of fit between our stories of our practices as teacher educators and Zach's and Susan's stories as students, as a tension between two versions of teacher education, that is, what it means "to get an education" and what it means "to become more experienced." I now outline some of the implicit meanings of reflective practice I see in these two versions of teacher education.

In the version of teacher education which Zach and Susan expected to live, they would "get an education" by receiving a body of professional knowledge from others. In this version, they expected they would reflect on the knowledge they were receiving by thinking about why and how it fit for them and their images of good teaching. In this version, they would think about the theoretical knowledge they were receiving from their university teachers in their university courses. They would then try to apply this professional knowledge in practice in their university assignments and in their practica. They would become more educated during their practica in two ways. They would accumulate the practical experience of implementing their theoretical professional knowledge. This is the story that Schon (1983, 1987) has called a story of technical rationalism. They would also receive knowledge about the practice of teaching from, and be evaluated by, their cooperating teachers who had more classroom experience than they did. This is the story often labelled as one of apprenticeship. In this version, Zach and Susan would pay attention to the professional knowledge with which they were presented in order to improve their telling and living of the good teaching stories they were trying to construct.

A version of reflective practice based on Dewey's (1938) notion of becoming more experienced through educative experience is a very different story. Here, reflective practice is not only reflection on the practice of teaching, but also the practice of reflecting on or inquiring into all experience in order to learn something new through experience. It is the dimension of reflective inquiry in Dewey's sense which is the basis of narrative inquiry. Reflection in teacher education that develops from narrative inquiry is the practice of focusing on each individual's experiences as expressed through his/her stories in order to explicate taken-for-granted knowledge about teaching and learning which has been constructed and reconstructed through experience. Each individual constructs his/her own meanings of the experience, shares his/her meanings with others as others share with him/her, and, in the process, each person learns new ways to think about the particular experience as well as new meanings to bring to future experience. In this version of teacher education, reflection is practiced as inquiry into individual's personal practical knowledge of good teaching constructed and reconstructed through experience. In this version, we are each teachers/students/learners of teacher education as our knowledge and questions about teaching and learning are shared with each other.

I briefly outline these two versions for they are central to understanding what Zach and Susan expected to live out in their experiences of teacher education. These versions are also central to the meanings Zach and Susan constructed from the language they

encountered during their teacher education programs and what these meanings might have led them to expect.

Zach believed the narrative reflective practice version of teacher education as inquiry did not count within the institutional contexts of his teacher education program. For Zach, knowledge was objective facts. Because each person's experience was different, for Zach, experience did not count as knowledge. Rather, he would use what he learned in his university classes as "background knowledge" to help him construct his own narrative knowledge of teaching once he began practicing as a teacher. He was unaware of the pervasive influence his narrative knowledge had on shaping what he paid attention to within his teacher education program. The narrative reflective practice version of teacher education as inquiry was a story Susan was struggling to live. At the same time she hoped to receive the professional knowledge she needed to construct her own good teaching story. When her narrative knowledge did not seem to count within the institutional contexts in which she found herself, she felt she was learning to live a cover story of good teaching which had few connections to the story of good teaching she was trying to construct.

Zach and Susan both knew they would be evaluated in their teacher education programs based on the professional knowledge which they were receiving. Their university teachers and cooperating teachers, all of whom knew more than they did, would evaluate their theoretical professional knowledge, their ability to apply this knowledge in practice, and their images of good teaching to see if they knew what were the "right" images and enough about these images. Zach and Susan knew they would need to set aside their personal practical knowledge of good teaching, that is, their images of good teaching, and pay attention to the versions of good teaching with which they were presented in their programs. Both Zach and Susan learned to reflect on these latter versions of good teaching in ways which would help them acquire knowledge which fit their own images of good teaching. Because they were searching for answers, reflective narrative inquiry focused toward questioning their own images of good teaching was not part of the teacher education story they felt encouraged to live.

In this section, I have outlined two versions of teacher education. The first draws on a view of paradigmatic knowledge and the second draws on a view of narrative knowledge. What is important to understand is that even though Zach and Susan were receiving paradigmatic knowledge, they were continuing to construct and reconstruct their narrative knowledge as they experienced the situations in their teacher education programs. Tension resulted when they tried to connect their narrative knowledge with the paradigmatic. In the next section, I focus on the tensions Zach and Susan experienced as

they tried to learn to live and tell stories of good teaching constructed and reconstructed through their personal practical knowledge developed through their narratives of experience when they knew their evaluations would be based on the stories of good teaching found in the professional knowledge they were receiving.

The Authority of Sacred Stories in Teacher Education

I first unpack some of the sources of tension Zach and Susan experienced between the version of "getting an education" played out in the stories of technical rationalism and apprenticeship, and the version of "becoming more experienced" played out in narrative reflective practice where knowledge is constructed and reconstructed through experience.

In the first version, based on a paradigmatic view of knowledge, it is possible to have objective truth uncontaminated by contextual contingencies and personal biases. Because knowledge can be true and absolute, there can be only one correct version. This knowledge is built up piece by piece. The truth of this knowledge is tested in its replicability enabling us to predict and thus control. It is also valued for its generalizability which provides principles to use in interpreting a variety of similar situations. This knowledge is public, molecular, and given. The stories of technical rationalism and apprenticeship are embedded within a sacred story that views knowledge as paradigmatic. When the truth is known about how things are, correct ways to implement practices through certainty, prediction and control are possible. Implementation of these correct ways occurs through apprenticeship of novices with those who are already competent. Thus, in this version, knowledge already constructed is passed on to others to use in practice. Knowing the truth, and knowing how to practice it, can lead to perfection with enough knowledge and enough practice. In this version, reflection on the discrepancy between the ideal predicted and what actually happened can lead to better practice and possible perfection. Knowing enough, enables determining what went wrong and, through this process, ways to improve practice are found and future situations are better controlled and closer to the ideal. In this version, questions are asked in order to find correct answers. This is the view of knowledge that Bruner (1990) calls paradigmatic and that Schon (1983, 1987) lays out as the most usual model of professional education. Following Crites (1971), I label it as a sacred story.

Reflective narrative inquiry is embedded in another sacred story, that is, a story in which knowledge is constructed and reconstructed through experience. In this version, knowledge is the organization of experience in meaningful and useful ways. There is no absolute truth, but rather better ways to interact in situations. Because each person's experience is different, what each person finds meaningful and useful differs. Each person

can tell a different story of a situation because each individual has a different experience in the situation. What is meaningful and useful differs in different situations. Thus, knowledge is integral with experience and is continually being reconstructed through experience. This view of knowledge does not imply that "this is the way it is" in any absolute sense but rather "this is the way it seems to me at this time and in this place." Here, the ways in which people give accounts of what happened is what happened for them and as such is their "truth." People's stories point to what they find unexpected, problematic, or out of the ordinary in the experience. Because stories also reflect the teller's moral stance in the world, stories cannot be correct or incorrect, but rather express a moral sense of right or wrong. Stories are told in order to have the teller's stance understood by him or herself and others as well as to get validation for having chosen to act in a certain way or to find out what could have been done to make the situation more meaningful and/or useful. Questions are asked in order to understand experience in more meaningful and useful ways. Knowledge is constructed and reconstructed as diverse stories are told. Hearing different perspectives gives us new ways to story past experience and imagine future possibilities. Knowledge emerges from experience through the practice of reflective inquiry. Construction and reconstruction of knowledge is the antithesis of certainty. This is a story where the personal, holistic, and problematic are valued. This is the view of knowledge that Bruner (1990) calls narrative and that Schon (1983, 1987) lays out as a model of reflective practice. It is a view that draws heavily on Dewey's (1938) conceptions of knowledge and teaching. Once again I label it a sacred story to indicate that it is fundamental and unquestioned in our practices.

Through their narratives of experience, Zach and Susan came to their teacher education programs already knowing what good teaching was. The narratives Zach and Susan had constructed and reconstructed of what it would mean to become good teachers were developed through their experiences in the contexts of schools and society. The ways in which they expected to get an education in their teacher education programs were stories of technical rationalism and apprenticeship. Their expectations of how they would become educated as teachers came from the sacred story of knowledge as paradigmatic.

Zach and Susan entered their programs expecting to increase their knowledge which would in turn increase their certainty and enable them to develop their confidence to become good teachers. While they each storied good teaching as knowing enough and knowing what to do, how they storied what they wanted to know and what they wanted to do differed. Zach's narrative knowledge of good teaching led him to pay attention to the subject area content. In his image of good teaching, he needed to know more subject area content than his students. In order to pass this knowledge on, he would need to be able to

"tell it clearly." As a teacher education student, Zach listened carefully to the information with which he was presented and was careful to construct assignments that presented his ideas clearly so others would understand what he was talking about. As a teacher education student he tried to fit in with what he believed his teachers expected. However, Susan's narrative knowledge of good teaching led her to want to know where each child was coming from in order for her to be able to construct a curriculum that would fit each child. To do this, she would need to know "everything there is to know about a child." She would also need to know the mandated curriculum thoroughly and have a variety of strategies for making the curriculum meaningful for each individual child. She would also need to know how she herself had learned in order to be able to help her students learn. As a teacher education student, she could not understand why her program was not constructed in a way that paid attention to her individual needs as a teacher education student nor to uncovering how she had learned what she would be required to teach to her students. She expected her teacher education program would fit with her image of what good teaching was.

Both Zach and Susan expected that learning the basic truths of good teaching would enable them to make responsible choices for their students although the way they imagined arriving at these basic truths differed. For Zach, knowledge was linear and hierarchical. His narrative knowledge of himself as a good teacher developed as he began to hear things repeated because this let him know he now had a base of his own. Because Zach believed knowledge was built up from a solid base, he knew argument was a way to gain certainty. If the knowledge constructed by others could be knocked down in an argument, their line of reasoning was faulty and their knowledge was uncertain. Argument could lead to better reasoning and thus more certainty. Because for Zach knowledge was certain, he asked questions to obtain correct answers from those who, because of their position of authority, already knew. If they could not provide correct answers, Zach believed this would threaten their position of authority. In the story Zach constructed of good teaching, he would need to have the answers or at least be able to find them. He expected his students would engage in the same process with him when he was the teacher. For Susan, each person's experience provided only a partial view of the truth. She wanted to construct a better understanding of the basic truths which underlie experience by uncovering taken-for-granted assumptions. Susan believed that by hearing a variety of perspectives focused on an issue, she would be able to develop a "broader picture" of reality. This would enable her to uncover her own biases as she incorporated the views of others into her own views. Susan believed sharing views would help her get at the underlying reality. This would provide her with the basics she would need in order

to become a good teacher. She could then take those basic truths and use them to construct a good teaching story which fit with the situations in which she found herself. Rather than finding the certainty that would result from hearing a variety of views, Susan felt more confused as she found the different perspectives to be contradictory. In her image of good teaching, she would need to be certain in order to make responsible choices for her students. She found the contradictions terrifying. As she asked more questions to overcome her uncertainty, the questions she asked led to more questions rather than to the answers she was seeking. She asked many questions in order to understand the ways in which individuals experienced situations. She also asked questions to try to place the paradigmatic knowledge she was receiving into contexts which were personally meaningful for her. Her reconstructions left her confused and feeling like she was not progressing. She could not account for what she knew until she was certain. Therefore, she felt she knew very little.

Zach and Susan each believed that becoming educated as teachers would mean receiving knowledge from those who already knew although they wanted to receive this knowledge in different ways. For Zach, because knowledge was linear and hierarchical, he needed to know what to do before he could do it. He wanted to be presented with the theory first so he would know what to pay attention to once he began the practice of teaching. He was pleased his program was constructed in a way which would enable him to receive the professional knowledge he would need to become a good teacher and then have an opportunity to practice what he had learned. Susan's image of life as a web led her to take a more holistic perspective. She could make little sense of the professional knowledge with which she was presented when she had no opportunity to experience this knowledge in practice and to make this new professional knowledge part of her personal practical knowledge through experience. She also found little connection between the images of good teaching embedded in the professional knowledge with which she was presented and her images of good teaching found in her narrative knowledge.

Zach and Susan both believed they would need to accumulate enough knowledge in order to be able to make the right decisions as teachers. Becoming experienced meant practicing what they had learned so they would be able to enact what they knew within the contextual contingencies of a classroom. In this expected version, they knew good teachers presented what they already knew to their students who did not yet know. Zach's main concern was whether he knew enough subject content to have the authority to teach it to others. He did not worry about actual teaching situations. This could not be taught ahead of time because each situation would be different. He would need to "read the situation" and then act in ways which fit his narrative knowledge. Because he could not

name this as knowledge, he did not focus his attention on making this kind of knowledge explicit. Susan wanted the opportunity to practice what she was learning before she actually began her practicum. She knew her cooperating teachers would be evaluating her on how well she was able to teach, not on how well she was able to learn to teach. Therefore, she wanted to know what she was doing before she had to present herself as certain and confident within a classroom. Susan's main concern then was to have opportunities to learn professional knowledge by making this paradigmatic knowledge part of her personal practical knowledge within her university classes before she was expected to perform as a teacher in a classroom.

Zach and Susan each valued the teaching experience of others and hoped to acquire knowledge from those who had more experience as teachers than they did themselves. They saw their practica as apprenticeships where they themselves were the novices who would learn from the expertise of experienced teachers. Zach knew he would need to fit into classrooms established by his cooperating teachers. Susan was pleased her practicum provided her with a variety of classroom placements. This gave her a broad range of teaching experiences with a variety of cooperating teachers. She was able to gain a variety of perspectives from others as well as a variety of practicum experiences. In this practicum as apprenticeship story, the more opportunity Zach and Susan had to practice what they had learned, the more certain they could become that they knew enough and knew what they were doing. They each developed confidence in their abilities to become good teachers as they accumulated knowledge from their cooperating teachers and from their practical experiences as student teachers. Gaining experience would enable them to predict and control classroom situations with more certainty.

They each strove for perfection as they tried to learn the "right way." In the paradigmatic version of teacher education, surprise and unexpectedness are storied as not knowing enough to be able to predict and to be in control. They knew as good teachers they were responsible for deciding what they wanted their students to learn. In order to make "right" decisions, Zach and Susan needed to be aware of alternate choices and their implications. In order to be able to predict what their students would learn, Zach and Susan knew they would need to be well planned and have clear objectives. This would give them the control needed to ensure they were not pulled off course by classroom contingencies. They would need to decide ahead of time what they were planning to teach in order to be able to evaluate their own teaching and their students' learning.

Zach and Susan knew each person's experience was different. However, to acknowledge that each child's experience was different in the classroom would mean giving up their images of good teaching as knowing ahead of time what was best for their

students. If students constructed their own knowing, Zach and Susan could not imagine knowing what to do with students or how to keep ahead of their students. They also would not know how to evaluate what their students had learned if they did not know ahead of time what they themselves had chosen to teach. They each storied their uncertainty as not yet knowing enough. Because they did not question their images of good teaching as knowing enough and being certain, unexpected events continued to be storied as problems which could be overcome once they knew enough.

Zach and Susan were in programs which emphasized the value of reflective practice. Both believed they were becoming reflective practitioners. What Zach and Susan chose to pay attention to in their teacher education programs were expressions of their narrative knowledge. What was problematic for them caught their attention. These problems were storied as "trouble," something that should not happen. Problems were a bad reflection on their ability to become good teachers. They expected to be presented with the knowledge that would help them attain the certainty they felt they needed to resolve problems in order to become good teachers. They each paid attention to reflecting on the knowledge with which they were presented and asked questions in order to find answers to help them become the good teachers they wanted to be. Neither Zach nor Susan inquired into their own images of good teaching in ways which could make their own narrative knowledge useful to them. Because they both questioned in order to find the answers which could help them become more certain, questioning themselves made them more aware of how little they knew and how uncertain they were. Because they believed there <u>were</u> answers, they turned their questioning outwards towards those they felt would have the answers. Questioning to understand their own narrative constructions was not part of their story of good teaching nor was it part of the story of teacher education they felt compelled to author. Zach and Susan both knew they were in programs where they would be evaluated for what they knew and how well they presented what they knew. Questioning their own assumptions was not possible as they tried to build their own certainty.

As I worked with Zach and Susan I was amazed at how differently they constructed and reconstructed their narrative knowledge of good teaching. I was also amazed at how their narrative knowledge was a holistic representation of their worlds. What was most amazing to me was the way in which this narrative knowledge was ignored in the process of learning to become good teachers.

I now turn my attention to some of the sources of tension for Zach and Susan as they tried to integrate the professional paradigmatic knowledge they expected to receive

with their personal sense of integrity expressed through their narrative knowledge of good teaching.

Integrating Narrative and Paradigmatic Knowledge

Both Zach and Susan wanted to learn the authorized versions of good teaching they expected to be presented during their programs. At the same time, they knew they needed to author teaching stories that fit with their images of good teaching constructed from their narratives of experience.

Zach's image of life as a path reflected and was reflected in the sacred story of objective truth, a paradigmatic view of knowledge. He knew his narrative knowledge had no place in the explicit curriculum of teacher education. He planned to take what fit for him from the curriculum constructed by those who knew more than he did. Once he had enough experience, he would know better what would work for him. He could then construct an image of himself as a good teacher as he made his choices based on both what he had received from others and what he knew worked for him. He knew he would need to know enough in order to be able to author himself as a good teacher once he became a practicing teacher. He knew each person would make different choices of what would work for him/her because everyone's narrative knowledge was different. He strove to be the best teacher he could be as he asked questions of himself and others which could help him find the correct ways for himself.

As Susan tried to live her image of life as an interdependent web, she often felt herself torn as she tried to construct an image of herself as a good teacher. The story she lived of learning to teach through reflective inquiry was a competing story with her desire to learn the basic truths she felt she would need to know in order to become the kind of teacher she thought was expected of her. She was caught between two worlds -- Bruner's (1986) two possible worlds of narrative and paradigmatic knowledge -- which she was trying to integrate into a cohesive whole in order to gain the certainty she felt she needed to become a good teacher.

Sources of tension emerged as Zach and Susan felt compelled to construct assignments in ways which would be storied by their teachers as evidence of their understanding of good teaching. This was necessary in order to get a good evaluation which would in turn show they could become good teachers. At times Zach's and Susan's images of good teaching were not the images they felt encouraged to express.

Both content and format became problematic as Zach and Susan tried to express their knowledge in ways constructed by others. Zach used his image of good teaching to construct assignments which were clearly reasoned arguments. He knew he needed to take

one side or another and defend his position. He also knew the content he included in his assignments could not come from his narrative knowledge unless he could reference someone who already had authority to give him the credibility he needed. Zach was usually able to find credible sources to back up his position. However, constructing a teacher centered lesson was problematic because Zach believed good teaching required the involvement of his students. When he chose to construct this assignment in ways which fit with his narrative knowledge of good teaching, he worried about the evaluation he would receive. Susan seldom found her images of good teaching expressed by others. She could find little validation for her narrative knowledge of good teaching within the references from the authorized versions she was required to read and cite. She seldom agreed with the images of good teaching expressed by others and seldom found others who could help her clarify and make explicit for herself the good teaching story she was trying to construct. She felt compelled to set aside her narrative knowledge to construct a cover story of certainty which expressed what she felt her teachers wanted to hear. Her own voice and her knowing were silenced from herself as well as from others. This left her feeling she was constructing her assignments for her teachers to get the mark rather than constructing assignments to help her understand how to put her images of good teaching into practice. Susan also became frustrated with the format she felt compelled to use. She could not make the holistic connection she was attempting to construct within the linear format she felt required to use.

This tension became more intense as Zach and Susan knew their assignments would be ranked against the assignments of others in the class. They would not be recognized for the integrity of their individual images of good teaching but rather their integrity would be ranked with others. They needed to receive a mark better than others in the class. Given the limited number of good grades assigned in each class, they knew not everyone could get a good grade. Without a good grade, they would not be seen as good enough since only the best would get teaching positions. In order to compete, they needed to prepare assignments that demonstrated their competence. This plot line of competition led Zach and Susan to live a cover story of certainty which closed down their ability to pay attention to what they each found problematic.

Because Zach and Susan both thought that good teachers were certain, they knew they needed to present "certain" knowledge in their assignments. They knew the authorized version in teacher education and in teaching was one of teachers as certain, knowledgeable experts. When Zach and Susan became confused as they tried to make connections between their personal practical knowledge and the professional knowledge being presented by those in authority, they turned their attention to resolving the tension by

either discounting their narrative knowledge or by ignoring the professional knowledge with which they were presented. The problems they needed to pay attention to in order to uncover their narrative knowledge of good teaching to understand themselves and use their knowledge to enact images of good teaching was ignored both because they sought answers from others as well as received assignment problems set for them by others.

As Zach and Susan tried to make sense of what they were being presented with, they implicitly used their personal practical knowledge as a reference point. However, what they named as problematic was understanding what they were being given rather than trying to understand their personal practical knowledge of good teaching. Zach and Susan could not make sense of stories which did not fit their images of good teaching. Because Zach found many implicit connections between his narrative knowledge of good teaching and what he felt required to do in his program, he seldom needed to question either his narrative knowledge or the paradigmatic knowledge he was being presented. He knew he would choose what fit for him. He did not need to question things that already made sense to him. The connections he made remained implicit expressions of his narrative knowledge. Susan seldom found connections between her narrative knowledge of good teaching and the paradigmatic knowledge of the program. She doubted the knowledge she was supposed to be receiving as well as doubted her own ability to enact her images of good teaching. She did not doubt her narrative knowledge but rather her ability to express that knowledge in practice. Since their narrative knowledge was never made explicit, it was not open for reconstruction. Since narrative knowledge did not seem to count, both Zach and Susan made few explicit connections between the body of knowledge they were receiving and their narrative knowledge. When explicit connections were not made, paradigmatic knowledge remained decontextualized theory and narrative knowledge remained implicit and intuitive.

Zach and Susan learned to ignore what was problematic for them as problems were set for them in the assignments constructed by their teachers. When the problems set in assignments were not relevant to their personal practical knowledge of good teaching, the assignments seemed irrelevant to what Zach and Susan felt they needed to pay attention to. Zach and Susan then went through the motions of constructing assignments aimed at getting good marks while, at the same time, feeling they had not learned anything useful in helping them become good teachers. This became a process of covering the curriculum rather than uncovering underlying assumptions. For Zach, when this happened, it was not problematic for Zach held an image of good teaching as covering the curriculum. Doing assignments in this way did not lead Zach to question his image of good teaching as covering the curriculum even though as a student he described this as playing the game.

He knew the narrative connections he would make needed to come after his program was finished. Susan had expected to uncover underlying assumptions and was continually frustrated with assignments which for her covered over the problems she felt she needed to address.

Zach and Susan tried to pay attention to, and make sense of, the authorized versions of good teaching with which they were presented. At the same time they tried to find examples of good teaching in the authorized versions which fit with their own images of good teaching. They struggled to have a clear sense of what they were going to do as good teachers and how they would enact their images of good teaching. Accommodating new stories of good teaching would upset the worlds they were struggling to construct leaving them vulnerable and lost when they were striving to fit in and be certain.

Educative Experience as Choosing to Stay Awake

Zach and Susan entered their teacher education programs expecting to be cultivated (Connelly & Clandinin, in preparation) as good teachers by learning the versions of good teaching authored by those who had more knowledge and experience than they did themselves. Through this cultivation process they believed they would acquire the body of professional knowledge they would need to become good teachers. Both Zach and Susan were overwhelmed by what they felt they needed to pay attention to during their programs. They found it difficult enough to make sense of the professional knowledge they were receiving and even more difficult when they tried to focus their attention on building a solid base from which to construct their own good teaching stories. The surprise necessary to awaken them to their taken-for-granted assumptions was not enough to enable them to pay attention to learning from the unexpected when they knew they would be evaluated on what they had learned from what they had been presented and on how well they were able to demonstrate their knowledge.

Awakening to the possibility of learning through reflective inquiry was in conflict with the story of good teaching as certainty, prediction, and control that Zach and Susan were trying to construct. Because there was always something new to pay attention to, Zach and Susan each wanted to hold on to what they believed they knew. Reconstructing what they already knew would destroy any confidence they had built up and return them to the vulnerability of feeling like they knew nothing at all and were not progressing toward their goal of becoming good teachers. For example, when Zach entered his four week practicum, he was unable to make sense of what was happening. He questioned what was happening in order to find the "right" version so he could fit himself into the existing structure. He did not question what was happening in the sense of understanding why

school timetables might have been constructed that way, what other possible ways might be, or how the timetable would affect his teaching. He believed he needed to fit with the authorized version in order to be seen as a good teacher. For Zach, new things were problematic because they caused him to stop and ask questions which took time away from what he was able to accomplish. He was pleased when he understood what was happening for he could then develop routines and habits which he could take for granted and would no longer need to think about or question. He could then move on to the next thing to which he chose to pay attention. He found within the contexts of the university and the schools, moving on was a necessary part of covering the curriculum. Each new piece of knowledge he acquired led him to believe he was coming closer to his goal of becoming a good teacher. When Susan began her program, she was continually frustrated by others whom she felt were going with the flow and were not questioning underlying assumptions. When she found her own narrative inquiries ignored and denied as important by others both in and outside her teacher education program, she felt torn as she tried to maintain the integrity of her own narrative knowledge of good teaching while at the same time having this knowledge denied by others as a central component of becoming a good teacher. For Susan, awakening to the possibility that she would need to depend on herself to construct her good teaching story on her own was terrifying. The variety of perspectives she was receiving did not lead her to what she expected as a broader perspective but rather to a Pandora's box of mixed messages and uncertainty which could only lead to trouble if she could not make sense out of them. She felt she needed to be certain in the choices she believed she would need to make as a good teacher.

While both Zach and Susan were uncertain whether they knew enough to become good teachers, neither of them awoke to the possibility that knowledge was uncertain and changing as it was constructed and reconstructed through the experiences of individuals. While this awakening would shake the very foundation on which they built their images of good teaching, this was exactly the awakening which could possibly have helped them focus attention on their authority of experience expressed through their integrity as persons. They knew their narrative knowledge was uncertain, changing, and open for reinterpretation as they experienced new situations. Because their narrative knowledge was always changing, they knew they could not trust it as a basis for the story of good teaching as certainty which they were trying to construct. Thus, they continued to ignore the very knowledge which could awaken them to understanding their images of good teaching as constructed through their previous experience and enable them to continue to construct and reconstruct their knowledge of good teaching through their experience as teachers.

Zach and Susan, through the stories they shared with me, helped me think carefully about my own wonders about teacher education. In the next section I begin to explore new possibilities for providing educative experiences within teacher education programs by helping students pay attention to the ways in which they construct and reconstruct images of good teaching.

Restorying Teacher Education

Paying Attention to the Authority of Sacred Stories

When we do not pay attention to the implicit authority of sacred stories in shaping our lives, we continue to read and narrate our lives and the lives of our students along the plot lines set for us in taken-for-granted ways. Making our mundane stories explicit provides an opportunity for us to focus attention on the sacred stories in which teacher education programs are embedded. It was this process of making the mundane stories of Zach and Susan explicit that provided insight into the sacred stories of teacher education. In this way, we can begin to pay attention to the question, "What does it mean to be prepared to teach?" By paying attention to the different answers constructed to respond to this question, we become aware of the different ways we imagine teacher education programs as preparation for teaching. This helps us understand the ways getting an education and becoming more experienced are embedded within different sacred stories. Once we imagine teacher education programs as institutional narratives constructed by interactions among individual persons over time, we can begin to understand how the plot lines of teacher education develop and we can begin to think about alternate possibilities.

When we believe we need to get an education in order to be prepared to teach, education is storied as a product received rather than as the ability to learn through our experience. We add more courses thinking students need to receive particular information in order to know enough before they can teach. We pay attention to what courses we believe students need to take and what the best order of presentation would be. The knowledge which individual students construct and reconstruct through personal experience seems out of place in this story of constructing a good teacher education curriculum.

When getting an education is storied as the accumulation of knowledge, knowing becomes hierarchically structured. In this story university professors know more than classroom teachers; classroom teachers know more and better than their students. Relationships become positional and knowledge is transmitted from those who know to those who do not. Teachers need to be prepared to present information to their students,

construct assignments for students, and evaluate students' assignments in order to let both their students and themselves know whether particular students know enough and are prepared to become good teachers. This is the traditional story of preparation for good teaching which makes constructing meaning with students impossible.

Imagining an educative teacher education curriculum based on reflective inquiry where students construct and reconstruct their personal practical knowledge through experience is a different story. In a version of teacher education as reflective inquiry, there is a basic assumption that students come to their teacher education programs with their own personal practical knowledge of good teaching. Paying attention by inquiring into this knowledge opens up possibilities for learning through the authority of experience. When we place the personal practical knowledge of the individuals involved at the center of our teacher education curriculum, we begin to pay attention not only to what we know, but how we know, how we come to know, and why we choose to know in particular ways. We begin to experience ourselves as dynamic learners and as such live rather than only tell a story of lifelong learning. In this way it becomes possible to find integrity as a teacher/learner/researcher in a classroom community. In the alternative practicum program described in Clandinin et al. (1993), student teachers, classroom teachers, and university teachers all became researchers of their own teaching and learning as they worked together to develop better understandings of their own teaching and the teaching of others as they shared stories of their experiences. In this version, we each become consumers and producers of knowledge. Zach began to experience this during his eight week practicum when his cooperating teacher, Anne, gave him the freedom to construct his own lessons and asked him questions which helped him clarify his understanding. He then described the classroom as his own and was able to risk trying new things. Susan felt like a learner, not a student, in her Science class when her questions and suggestions were seen as an important contribution to understanding how an electric circuit worked in class. In reflective inquiry, questions become the focus rather than only answers. When it is not assumed there is one correct answer or one right way, questions lead to understanding as students become researchers of their own knowledge. When understandings lead to more questions, learning becomes self-motivated in a version of lifelong learning which is not only focused toward acquiring what is already known, but also inquiring into what is already known and focusing on constructing our own future possibilities. In this version, what is problematic to us provides the impetus for future learning as we try to understand ourselves and others.

When we imagine teacher education as reflective inquiry, constructing alternate possibilities is possible when we understand that the process of coming to know through

constructing and reconstructing meaning cannot be presented as conclusions or products with any sense of certainty. Meaning is always open to reconstruction as what we begin to know leads to further inquiry. Constructing and reconstructing knowledge is a process and, as such, is a constantly shifting intangible. It is messy and uncertain. Teaching, as a process of helping students construct and reconstruct meaning in their own ways, is messy and uncertain.

Restorying teacher education as reflective inquiry with students may be storied as "not doing anything" by those expecting to "get an education." When we become participants in learning with our students, we may be storied as "not doing our job" by those who live hierarchical versions of education. It is important to explicitly bring different views of knowledge and how that knowledge is acquired to the awareness of our students as well as different ways of valuing what we know and how we come to know if misunderstandings about the teacher education stories we are trying to live are to be overcome.

Narrative Authority as Personal and Professional Integrity

When I returned to university as a graduate student, I had 19 years of stories from my personal practical knowledge as a teacher to bring to the theories I was reading. I had much narrative knowledge to help bring the decontextualized theories to life. I could construct new ways to story my past experience as well as new ways to story future experience. Teacher education students, however, have not begun to recognize themselves as holders of personal practical knowledge of good teaching. They expect to be cultivated as good teachers through their teacher education programs by receiving knowledge from others. When we expect to get an education, the reference point is external to ourselves. We seek the known from a body of knowledge held by those whom we believe have authority and expertise. When we cannot find personal connections with this paradigmatic knowledge from expert authorities, we may memorize this knowledge to give back on exams without finding meaning in it for ourselves. This was part of my own story of preservice teacher education. We may turn instead to our subjective knowing and the authority of our own narrative experience. Here the authority of personal experience becomes the reference point. If there is no connection between the two, theory remains irrelevant and personal knowledge remains implicit. We do not learn from our experience nor from the paradigmatic knowledge we receive from others. We continue to do things in ways we have found meaningful and useful in the past. We teach as we were taught. It is, however, when we begin to inquire into our experience that we can begin to make use of the paradigmatic knowledge we receive from others to help us restory our past experience

and to imagine future possibilities. We bring our narrative meanings to the text, reconstruct new meanings as we interact with the text, and leave with better understandings of our own narrative knowledge as well as of the paradigmatic knowledge with which we have come in contact .

We need to help students make explicit connections between the narrative knowledge they bring to teacher education and the paradigmatic knowledge we present. Having teacher education students write or tell stories of their past experience and present experience as students (Knowles & Cole, 1993) can provide examples for inquiry into students' personal practical knowledge of good teaching. Because these stories are expressions of individuals' personal practical knowledge, we must take their stories seriously. We need to honor these stories as expressions of the authors' stances in the world. We need to believe in the personal practical knowledge of our students if they are going to begin to believe in themselves as having knowledge constructed through the authority of their own experience.

When students' stories become the explicit reference point, what is problematic for them emerges. Others' stories and theories can then provide relevant alternate ways of helping students uncover sources of tension and of imagining ways to restory educative situations. In this way students acknowledge both their personal practical knowledge as well as professional knowledge and are enabled to make personally meaningful connections between their implicit knowing and the knowledge they receive from others. They can also begin to understand themselves and others better as well as to begin to live an explicit story of knowledge as socially constructed. Alternate possibilities become available. When Zach returned to his university classes after his four week practicum, everything seemed relevant to him. He began to pay attention to teaching strategies as well as to subject content knowledge. The strategies he paid most attention to were the ones which could help him understand better ways to deal with situations which he had found problematic in his practicum. This was not necessarily the focus of his teacher education courses, but rather was the focus Zach gave to his courses. Susan continually struggled to make her learning meaningful by trying to imagine herself in a classroom context as well as by imagining the problems she might have in implementing what she was learning. Not having the opportunity to develop her own knowledge of teaching until the last year of her program, she found herself memorizing the paradigmatic knowledge with which she was presented without finding it meaningful or useful. Because she made few connections between the paradigmatic knowledge and her narrative knowledge of good teaching, she felt torn and frustrated as the paradigmatic knowledge remained decontextualized theory and her narrative knowledge remained implicit. Both seemed useless to her. She had an

intuitive sense of what she wanted to do as a good teacher, but had few explicit ideas of how to enact her images of good teaching within a classroom. It was this "how to" Susan so desperately sought in her program.

When we understand knowledge as socially constructed, we need to make spaces in our classes for the conversations which are essential in order to tell, hear, and respond to the stories of ourselves and others. Through the opportunity for conversation students can hear a variety of views and experiences which may awaken them to new ways to story their own experience. Conversation is not a process of telling what we know, but rather a collaborative endeavor where each participant brings meaning and questions to the conversation. As stories are told, given back, and retold, "knowledge communities" (Craig, 1992) develop in which knowledge is constructed in the transactions between individuals.

When we construct meaning through conversation, the reference point exists in the transaction, the space between the individuals involved. This is a "middle ground" (Clandinin et al., 1993) which needs to be a safe space in order for the persons involved to risk making their narrative knowledge public. This middle ground is not possible in the sacred story of certainty, prediction and control where knowledge (and, therefore, the people who hold that knowledge) is hierarchically structured. The middle ground is a collaborative space where each individual struggles to articulate and inquire into his or her own knowing of educative situations. It is the diversity of knowledge expressed in a collaborative situation which makes reconstruction of knowledge possible. Susan found this particularly difficult in her group assignments. While she appreciated the variety of views which opened up new possibilities, she knew the group had to reach a consensus in order to construct an assignment to be handed in for evaluation by her teacher. She knew her group would be evaluated on the work they were able to produce, not on the group process of constructing the assignment. This middle ground needs to be a safe space not in the sense of a space where consensus and agreement are possible, but in the sense of a space to risk voicing one's own uncertainty as well as hearing opposing views, alternative perspectives, and unauthorized versions of good teaching. A middle ground develops in relationships built with others over time, something Susan did not have in the pressure of completing multiple group assignments with different individuals. Susan found this middle ground developing in relationships with other Special Education students whom she had grown to know throughout her program. She described this group as "a resource" in her teacher education.

Only when our knowledge is shared can it be open for interpretation and inquiry. Because Susan found little space to share and to have her knowledge acknowledged, she

could not place it in the open for reinterpretation. When others did not seem to see her or themselves as having personal practical knowledge of good teaching, she began to doubt both her own knowledge and the possibility of making her knowledge explicit in order to begin to understand and value it herself.

Creating safe spaces for people to share their knowledge is not an easy task. Many factors silence our narrative knowledge as we try to shape ourselves to the canons and authorized versions we may feel compelled to tell. When the stories we tell differ from the stories we live, we may live a cover story of self-deception (Crites, 1979). Stengel (1993) states that "when we put the moral at the center of our teaching, everything becomes problematic." We cannot help teacher education students understand where they stand until we begin to understand where we stand. Uncovering taken-for-granted assumptions is risky since these assumptions shape our knowledge about who we are and our relationship to others. Therefore, we need to honor each others' stories as we try to understand them.

In order for students to trust the authority of their personal practical knowledge they need to have this authority valued by those of us who are already teachers, either in the university or school classrooms. Zach began to find this happening in his eight week practicum with Anne. As he began to trust the authority of his own knowledge, he began to trust the authority of his students' knowledge as well. Sharing our own stories with our students and constructing new stories informed by the stories and theories of others including our students is a way to live rather then only tell a story of educative experience.

Covering the curriculum preplanned by others diverts attention from what students find problematic to what their teachers have set out as problematic. When students expect to get an education from someone who already knows, it only becomes possible for the teacher to set the problems and to ask questions to which he/she already knows the answer. When students are encouraged to search out problems relevant to their personal practical knowledge, their learning becomes relevant as they inquire into issues that inform both their personal and professional authority. They can begin to see themselves as constructors of knowledge. Susan found this happening for her in her Science methods class during her second term. For her, this was a story of good teaching as she was able to construct and reconstruct her own knowledge. Zach also found this happening during his journal writing and his eight week practicum. His image of knowledge as objective fact was too strong to allow him to acknowledge this as new knowledge he had constructed from his authority of experience in interaction with paradigmatic knowledge. He was surprised and wondered where the knowledge had come from since he had not heard it anywhere else.

Students can also begin to integrate their personal and professional authority through more connected practicum experiences where students inquire into their practice and use the knowledge of others to uncover and inform what they already know (Clandinin et al., 1993). In Clandinin and her colleagues' accounts of teacher education, university teachers, cooperating teachers, and student teachers learned from each other and the children in their care. Living a story of practicum as reflective inquiry rather than presentation of what is already known requires all participants to be aware of the dominant sacred story of getting an education traditionally authored in the hierarchical structure of educational institutions. In this story, those higher in the educational hierarchy know more which they in turn pass on to those who know less. Living a story of reflective inquiry where all participants share in the construction and reconstruction of knowledge about good teaching goes against the grain of the traditional story of good teaching. In order to live this story, participants need to stay awake to the stories they are constructing.

Educative Experience as Choosing to Stay Awake

In order to stay awake, students as well as teachers need to be encouraged to learn from the unexpected and to pay attention to what they find problematic. In this story, knowledge is always open for reconstruction. We need to encourage students and teachers to think carefully about asking good questions and about searching out problems as well as about providing new answers and imaginative solutions. In the story of getting an education, once something is known it becomes taken-for-granted and is no longer questioned. As knowledge is accumulated, it becomes easier to fall asleep and not see other new possibilities (Greene, 1988). Certainty does not lead to inquiry. When we know what to do, this knowledge can become habitual and we may choose to continue to go through the motions. When we take what we know for granted, we no longer choose to stay awake. Presenting what we already know to students does not encourage them to participate in a story of lifelong learning. By staying awake ourselves to possibilities of reconstructing our own knowing, we can provide our students with the possibility of reconstructing their own knowledge, that is, to the possibility of a lived story of educative experience.

We can begin to do this by inquiring into our own narrative knowledge of good teaching with our students. One thing which has become apparent in this inquiry is that each teacher stories curriculum as an expression of his/her personal practical knowledge. If we are going to enable teacher education students to inquire into and make explicit their images of good teaching, we, as teacher educators, need to inquire into and make explicit our images of good teaching. Both Zach and Susan knew they needed to figure out what

each of their teachers wanted from them. They also knew what their teachers wanted were expressions of their teachers' personal practical knowledge of good teaching. By inquiring into our narrative knowledge of good teaching as teacher educators and making our images of good teaching explicit, we can all learn from each other.

To do this we need to learn to live a story of teacher education which goes against the grain of the dominant story of teacher as expert. We need to think carefully about the stories we hear and tell. When communal stories are taken for granted, they are accepted as the only right or possible ways to author lives within the community. Taken-for-granted constructions of technical rationalism and apprenticeship implicitly shape the authorized versions presently accepted in teacher education. In order to make spaces for understanding the process of constructing knowledge, we need to widen our focus from only looking for the presentation of what is known and begin to listen more carefully for the ways in which we each construct and reconstruct our knowing of good teaching to create meaningful educational situations. We need to continually inquire into our own practice in order to stay awake to the sacred stories which are lived in educational contexts. When we begin to understand that each person constructs and reconstructs different knowledge of good teaching in different ways, we can begin to pay attention to understanding where each person is coming from rather than where we expect them to be. We can begin to make space for a diversity of ways of knowing. By making these images explicit with our students and colleagues, we enrich our understanding rather than increase our certainty.

Covering a curriculum constructed by others leads students to pay attention to what is expected by others and to view knowledge as given. Surprise can awaken us to new ways of storying experience and constructing knowledge. We no longer accept what is given but awaken to wonder how it came to be and what other possible ways it could be. In inquiry, answers are not known ahead of time. We do not question to confirm what we know, but to construct new ways of knowing.

There is so much that could be known that imagining ways of designing teacher education programs can become overwhelming. One way this is done is by providing a large variety of courses as electives from which students choose. However, giving students more choice of the classes they can take is not as important as giving them choices within their classes to construct meaning in their own ways and to make this knowledge explicit. In order to author their own lives as good teachers, students will pay attention to what is relevant and/or problematic for them. Thus, their selection of what to pay attention to is an expression of the plot lines they are trying to construct and reconstruct in their stories of good teaching. As students are given the opportunity to construct assignments

which are personally meaningful for them, they are motivated to ask questions which will help them understand better ways to author their lives as teachers. As they are given the opportunity to inquire into what they find problematic they can begin to author assignments which pay attention to both their narrative knowledge of good teaching as well as the paradigmatic knowledge which can help them retell their good teaching stories in new ways. They can begin to believe in the authority of their own choices and choose to stay awake to the practice of reflective inquiry necessary for learning through experience.

Reflections on Narrative Inquiry as a Research Methodology

It was not until near the end of this narrative inquiry that I was able to begin to understand what the process of narrative inquiry was about. Narrative inquiry has pushed the horizons of my knowing and will continue to do so. Narrative inquiry does not confirm what we already know, but rather makes us rethink what we thought we knew. It is this continual reconstruction which makes narrative inquiry so difficult. Finding my knowing continually shifting has made the writing very difficult. Just when I think I know something, a comment from someone else or a new experience would make me rethink and often rewrite.

Narrative inquiry explores new possibilities which emerge during the research process and thus is a form of educative experience. Because I could not know ahead of time what would emerge, I often felt submerged and confused. There were many times when I said, "I can't do this." And of course, I couldn't. If I could already do it, I would not be learning. However, as I looked back on what I had done, I could see a narrative history developing. This does not mean I now know how to do narrative inquiry. While I have learned to "do" narrative inquiry through the process of narrative inquiry, each inquiry must take the shape of what emerges during the process and as such each narrative inquiry is unique. Thus, it is impossible to set out a definitive set of steps in the process.

Mostly, I have trusted my intuition as well as the stories Zach and Susan chose to tell me. Zach was concerned from the beginning about whether or not he was telling me what I needed to know. I trusted that whatever he chose to tell me was exactly what I needed to know. Near the beginning of this inquiry I was frustrated when the inquiry did not seem to be going the way it should. My husband asked me, "What isn't happening that you expected to happen?" This question made me realize I did have an implicit set of expectations. I answered, "I'm not supposed to be expecting anything in particular." In some ways this helped, but if I did not know what I was looking for, then how would I know when I had found it? Narrative inquiry required patience and trust in the process.

Rather than focusing on what I was looking for, I needed to focus on what I had found. At the same time, I was amazed when, a year into the process, I reread my research proposal and found I was doing exactly what I had set out to do.

What has been crucial to me has been the opportunity to have conversations with Zach and Susan as well as others involved in the process of narrative inquiry. Because narrative inquiry is a process of constructing and reconstructing personal practical knowledge as told through stories, it is necessarily collaborative. It is the process of sharing subjective views which has enabled me to come to new understandings.

Another crucial factor has been the relationships I have developed and maintained with Zach and Susan over time. Narrative inquiry is a long range commitment. It requires caring about the people involved in the research and being available to them when necessary. Traditional ethical research guidelines do not begin to address the issues which emerge in narrative inquiry.

Each research methodology enables researchers to construct knowledge in particular ways. Narrative inquiry pays attention to the ways in which individuals construct and reconstruct their personal practical knowledge over time through interactions with their physical and social contexts. As such, it has made me aware of how unique and pervasive each person's personal practical knowledge is. I have also become aware of how complex the interactions are between individuals as they each author their own lives while at the same time are characters in the lives authored by others. Each story has multiple possible tellings and each life has multiple narrative plot lines. I find this complexity fascinating and overwhelming.

Using narrative inquiry in research on teacher education and development seems to me to be particularly appropriate because it gets at the process of educative experience and has helped me understand some of the complexities of learning to teach. It has enabled me to pay attention to the knowledge Zach and Susan brought with them to their teacher education programs and focus on how this narrative knowledge was a crucial component in determining the ways in which they experienced their teacher education programs. I imagine narrative inquiry as a possible way to enable teacher education students to inquire into their own personal practical knowledge of good teaching, making this knowledge both explicit and useful to them in learning to teach.

New Research Wonders

There are many ways I could have chosen to story this narrative inquiry. Throughout the inquiry process I have made choices of where to focus my attention. By

selecting to tell certain stories in certain ways I have chosen to ignore other tellings. The selection has been difficult. I chose to illuminate a particular plot line. Along the way there have been many "trap doors, secret gardens, and hidden staircases" (Clark, 1993b) which have tempted me. I now revisit some of these wonders which I passed by and imagine other plot lines to explore.

As I came to know Zach and Susan, I was struck by the paradoxical nature of their stories. They each seemed to be telling me something very different yet I could hear the similarities within their differences. Zach's and Susan's stories each contained paradoxical contradictions as well. They each contained their own opposite. These opposing forces created tensions which caught my attention. For me, it is these tensions which point to the problematic and enable me to question taken-for-granted assumptions and begin to imagine new possibilities. Zach and Susan each paid attention to their own tensions while I paid attention to the tensions created for me between their stories and my stories.

For me, narrative inquiry provides a way to begin to explore the tensions and sources of tension which are inevitable and necessary for learning to occur. At times the sources of tension come from within the individual as he or she tries to resolve internal conflicts. At times the sources of tension arise in the interactive nature of experience as we try to understand ourselves and others in social situations. The tensions which have surfaced for me in this inquiry point to many sources of future research. I outline four possibilities.

Evaluation has been a central source of tension in the present inquiry. I imagine evaluation as a way of paying attention to what we value. There was a continual tension for Zach and Susan as they tried to construct their own images of themselves as good teachers while at the same time knowing they needed to pay attention to the images of good teaching constructed by their teachers who would evaluate their ability to become good teachers. Zach and Susan felt compelled to construct assignments in ways which would give them good marks. To do this, they needed to pay attention to what their teachers valued and often ignored what they themselves saw as more relevant to helping them construct good teaching stories. When what Zach and Susan valued as good teaching was ignored by themselves or their teachers, these values remained implicit. Both Zach and Susan also believed they would be evaluated on what they knew. This led them to cover over their uncertainty and avoid risking new things. If they were going to be evaluated by others, they would need to make a good impression by expressing their certainty. There seemed to be no place within the evaluation process Zach and Susan experienced to make space for valuing their narrative knowledge of good teaching. There also did not seem to be space to value the uncertainty that leads us to reflective inquiry. I imagine research

possibilities focused on finding better ways to value the process of becoming good teachers through reflective inquiry.

Another source of tension for me has been how educational relationships are storied. When a hierarchical relationship exists, constructing and reconstructing knowledge through collaboration becomes impossible. Students expect their teachers to know more and better. Reflective inquiry is not possible when it appears that the teacher already has the answer. While some teacher educators (Clandinin et al., 1993; Clark, 1993a; Knowles & Cole, 1993; Hollingsworth, 1992; Lyons, 1992) are beginning to live a teacher education story of reflective inquiry, it is difficult to restory teacher education as reflective inquiry within hierarchical institutions. I imagine research possibilities that pay attention to the difficulties of living an educative story of collaboration and community which competes with the hierarchical nature of institutional narratives of education storied by individuals.

Constructing educational communities is also hindered by the emphasis on individual learning and the relationship of the teacher to his or her students. In the present inquiry, I was struck by the way in which Zach and Susan believed they, as teachers, would be the only ones responsible in the classrooms for the education of their students. Zach would deal with this by teaching everyone the same thing at the same time. Group work would come after he had covered the required curriculum. He could not imagine a different story. Because Susan believed she needed to address the individual needs of each student, she believed she would need to construct individual curricula for each of her students. This was only possible for her in a Special Education class where the enrollment was low. Susan imagined this would be next to impossible in a regular classroom. While Zach and Susan both valued community and working together, neither Zach nor Susan imagined the possibility that their students could learn from each other within their classroom contexts. I imagine research possibilities that pay attention to the ways in which individual learning and individual assessment are a competing story with building community in the classroom and the school. I also imagine research possibilities with education students that pay attention to learning as a collaborative endeavor.

For me it is important to pay attention to how research makes a difference in the lives of education students, teachers, and children. I believe for research to make a difference in the lives of individuals they need to be an integral part of the research process. What is problematic for them must be addressed. When people are encouraged to ignore or cover up what they find problematic, inquiry is not possible. I imagine research focused on the ways in which a middle ground develops in order for it to be possible to bring research questions into the open. I also imagine possibilities for

collaborative research shaped by what emerges as problematic for the individuals involved. I imagine a third possibility which pays attention to the ways in which the research process makes a difference to the individuals involved as well as the ways in which research does or does not transform practice.

I imagine these research possibilities taking place within educational situations involving teacher education students, university teachers, school teachers, and children. I imagine each person learning from each other as we share our understandings and questions. Reflective inquiry is not only a research agenda but a curriculum agenda as well.

For me, the roles of teacher/learner/researcher are integral. As I inquire into my practice as a teacher, I am a learner and researcher as well. As I pay attention to figuring out what I am doing in order to help students figure out what they are doing, I learn more about myself, my students, and the process of reconstructing knowledge. For me, every situation is filled with possibilities for inquiry. Thus, for me, future research will be integral with the situations in which I find myself.

References

Barrett, W. (1979). *The illusion of technique: A search for meaning in a technological civilization*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press.

Belenky, M., Clinchy, B., Goldberg, N., & Tarule, J. (1986). *Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind*. New York: Basic Books.

Brimfield, R. M. B., Roderick, J. A., & Yamamoto, K. (1983). Persons as researchers: Observations of the participants, *Curriculum Inquiry, 13* (1), 5-21.

Britzman, D. P. (1986). Cultural myths in the making of a teacher: Biography and structure in teacher education, *Harvard Educational Review, 56* (4), 442-456.

Britzman, D. P. (1989). Who has the floor? Curriculum teaching and the English student teacher's struggle for voice, *Curriculum Inquiry, 19* (2), 144-162.

Brown, L. M. (1991). Telling a girl's life: Self-authorization as a form of resistance. In C. Gilligan, A. G. Rogers and D. Tolman (Eds.) *Women, girls & psychotherapy: Reframing resistance*. (pp. 71-86). Binghamton, NY: Harrington Park Press.

Brown, L. M. & Gilligan, C. (1992). *Meeting at the crossroads: Women's psychology and girls' development*. Cambridge, MASS: Harvard University Press.

Bruffee, K. A. (1986). Social construction, language, and the authority of knowledge, *College English, 48* (8), 773-790.

Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bruner, J. (1987). Life as narrative, *Social Research, 54*(1), 11-32.

Bruner, J. (1990). *Acts of meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Buber, M. (1970). *I and thou* (W. Kaufmann, Trans.). New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Calderhead, J. (1989). Reflective teaching and teacher education, *Teaching and Teacher Education, 5* (1), 43-51.

Carse, J. P. (1986). *Finite and infinite games: A vision of life as play and possibility*. New York: Ballantine.

Carson, T. R. (1986). Closing the gap between research and practice: Conversation as a mode of doing research, *Phenomenology + Pedagogy, 4* (2), 73-85.

Carter, K. (1990). Teachers' knowledge and learning to teach. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (pp. 283-310). New York: Macmillan.

Chatman, S. (1990). *Coming to terms: The rhetoric of narrative in fiction and film*. London: Cornell University Press.

Clandinin, D. J. (1986). *Classroom practice: Teachers' images in action*. London: Falmer Press.

Clandinin, D. J. (1989). Developing rhythms in teaching: The narrative study of a beginning teacher's personal practical knowledge of classrooms, *Curriculum Inquiry, 19* (2), 121-141.

Clandinin, D. J. (1991). Narrative and story in teacher education. In T. Russell and H. Munby (Eds.) *Teachers and teaching: From classroom to reflection*. London: Falmer Press, 124-137.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1986). Rhythms in teaching: The narrative study of teachers' personal practical knowledge of classrooms, *Teaching and Teacher Education, 2* (4), 377-387.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1990). Narrative experience and the study of curriculum, *Cambridge Journal of Education, 20* (3), 241-253.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (in press). Personal experience methods. In N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research Methods*. San Francisco: Sage.

Clandinin, D. J., Davies, A., Hogan, P., & Kennard, B. (Eds.). (1993). *Learning to teach, teaching to learn: Stories of collaboration in teacher education*.. Teachers College Press: New York.

Clark, C. (1993a). *Rethinking educational psychology for teachers: Ideas for course reform.* American Educational Research Association conference. Atlanta, Georgia.

Clark, C. (1993b). in conversation during research project *Ordinary teachers' extraordinary moments*. Centre for Research for Teacher Education and Development, University of Alberta, May 10-21.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1988). *Teachers as curriculum planners*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry, *Educational Researcher, 19* (5), 2-14.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (in press). Telling teaching stories, *Teacher Education Quarterly*.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (in preparation). *Narrative and Education*.

Craig, C. (1992). *Coming to know in the professional knowledge context: Beginning teachers' experiences*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta.

Crites, S. (1971). The narrative quality of experience, *Journal of the American Academy of Religion, 39* (3), 292-311.

Crites, S. (1979). The aesthetics of self-deception, *Soundings, 62*,107-129.

Crites, S. (1986). Storytime: Recollecting the past and projecting the future. In Theodore R. Sarbin (Ed.) *Narrative psychology: The storied nature of human conduct.* New York: Praeger.

Descartes, R. (1989). *Discourse on method* (J. Veitch, Trans.). LaSalle, IL: Open Court.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and Education.* New York, NY: Macmillam.

Dewey, J., & Bentley, A. F. (1949). *Knowing and the known.* Boston: The Beacon Press.

Dewey, J. (1958). *Experience and Nature.* New York, NY: Dover Publications.

Dow, G. (1979). *Learning to teach: Teaching to learn.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Duckworth, E. (1986). Teaching as research, *Harvard Educational Review,* 56 (4), 481-495.

Eisler, R. (1987). *The chalice and the blade.* New York: HarperCollins Publishers.

Eisner, E. W. (1988). The primacy of experience and the politics of method, *Educational Researcher, June/July,* 15-20.

Elbaz, F. (1981). The teacher's "practical knowledge": Report of a case study, *Curriculum Inquiry, 11* (1), 43-71.

Elbow, P. (1981). *Writing with power.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Gadamer, H. G. (1975). *Truth and method.* New York: Crossroads.

Gilligan, C. (1991). Women's psychological development: Implications for psychotherapy. In C. Gilligan, A. G. Rogers and D. Tolman (Eds.) *Women, girls & psychotherapy: Reframing resistance.* (pp. 5-32). Binghamton, NY: Harrington Park Press.

Ginsburg, M. B., & Clift, R. (1990). The hidden curriculum of preservice education. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (pp. 450-465). New York: Macmillan.

Gitlin, A. D. (1990). Educative research, voice, and school change, *Harvard Educational Review, 60* (4), 443-466.

Grant, C. A., & Secada, W. G. (1990). Preparing teachers for diversity. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (pp. 403-422). New York: Macmillan.

Greene, M. (1988). *The dialectic of freedom.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation.* Newberry Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Guyton, E., & McIntyre, D. J. (1990). Student teaching and school experiences. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (pp. 514-534). New York: Macmillan.

Heidegger, M. (1977). *Basic writings*. New York: Harper & Row.

Hollingsworth, S. (1992). Learning to teach through collaborative conversation: A feminist approach, *American Educational Research Journal, 29*(2), 373-404.

Johnston, M. (1989). Embodied knowledge, *Curriculum Inquiry, 19* (4), 361-377.

Johnston, S. (1991, June 13). *Images of reflection*. Seminar at the University of Alberta, Faculty of Education.

Kelly, G. A. (1955). *A theory of personality: The psychology of personal constructs*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Knowles, J. G., & Cole, A. L. (1993). *Through preservice teachers' eyes: Exploring field experiences through narrative and inquiry*. New York: Macmillan Publishing.

Laing, R. D. (1971). *Knots*. London: Penguin Books.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lyons, N. (1990). Dilemmas of knowing: Ethical and epistemological dimensions of teachers' work and development. *Harvard Educational Review, 60* (2), 159-180.

Lyons, N. (1992). *Constructing narratives for understanding: Using portfolio-interviews to scaffold new teachers' reflective development.* Seminar presented at The Centre for Research for Teacher Education and Development, University of Alberta, Edmonton, May 14, 1992.

MacIntyre , A. (1981). *After virtue*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Maslow, A. H. (1971). *The farther reaches of human nature*. New York: Penguin Books.

Miklos, E., & Greene, M. L. (1987). Assessment by teachers of their preservice preparation programs, *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 33* (3), 191-205.

Mishler, E. G. (1990). Validation in inquiry-guided research: The role of exemplars in narrative studies, *Harvard Educational Review, 60* (4), 415-442.

Munby, H. & Russell, T. (1993). *The authority of experience in learning to teach: Messages from a physics methods class*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, Georgia, April, 1993.

Oakley, A. (1984). *Taking it like a woman*. London: HarperCollins Publishers.

Ong, W. J. (1982). *Orality & literacy: The technologizing of the word*. New York: Routledge.

Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct, *Review of Educational Research, 62* (3), 307-332.

Patterson, R. S. (1983). *Go, grit and gumption: A normal school perspective on teacher education*. McCalla Lecture, Faculty of Education.

Patterson, R. S. (1986). Voices from the past: The personal and professional struggle of rural school teachers. In D. C. Jones, N. M. Sheehan, & J. D. Wilson (Eds.), *Schools in the west: Essays in Canadian educational history.* Calgary: Detselig.

Polanyi, M. (1966). *The tacit dimension.* New York: Doubleday.

Ricoeur, P. (1983). *Time and narrative.* (Vol. 1). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Rogers, C. (1961). *On becoming a person.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Sacks, O. (1984). *A leg to stand on.* New York: HarperCollins Publishers.

Schon, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action.* New York: Basic Books.

Schon, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schutz, A. (1970). *On phenomenology and social relations: Selected writings* (H. R. Wagner, Ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Stengel, B. (1993) *Constructing the moral coutours of (teacher) education.* Panel presentation at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Atlanta, Georgia. April 12-16.

Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation.* New York: Ballantine Books.

Tappan, M. B., & Brown, L. M. (1989). Stories told and lessons learned: Toward a narrative approach to moral development and moral education, *Harvard Educational Review, 59* (2), 182-204.

Tom, A. R., & Valli, L. (1990). Professional knowledge for teachers. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (pp. 373-392). New York: Macmillan.

Urban, W. J. (1990). Historical studies of teacher education. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (pp. 59-71). New York: Macmillan.

Yarger, S. J., & Smith, P. L. (1990). Issues in research on teacher education. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 25-41). New York: Macmillan.

van den Berg, J. H. (1972). *A different existence*, Pittsburg, PA: Duquesne University Press.

Van Manen, M. (1977). Linking ways of knowing with ways of being practical, *Curriculum Inquiry, 6* , 205-228.

Van Manen, M. (1986). *The tone of teaching.* Richmond Hill, ONT: Scholastic-TAB.

Van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy.* University of Western Ontario: Althouse Press.

APPENDIX A

Dates of Transcribed Research Conversations with Zach

Transcript 1	May 17,1991
Transcript 2	May 21, 1991
Transcript 3	June 14, 1991
Transcript 4	July 19, 1991
Transcript 5	September 6, 1991
Transcript 6	Septemebr 16, 1991
Transcript 7	September 30, 1991
Transcript 8	October 15, 1991
Transcript 9	October 28, 1991
Transcript 10	November 12, 1991
Transcript 11	November 25, 1991
Transcript 12	November 27, 1991
Transcript 13	December 9, 1991
Transcript 14	December 17, 1991
Transcript 15	January 20, 1992
Transcript 16	February 3, 1992
Transcript 17	February 10, 1992
Transcript 18	February 18, 1992
Transcript 19	March 2, 1992
Transcript 20	March 16, 1992
Transcript 21	March 29, 1992
Transcript 22	April 22, 1992

APPENDIX B

Dates of Transcribed Research Conversations with Susan

Transcript 1	September 9, 1991
Transcript 2	September 23, 1991
Transcript 3	October 7, 1991
Transcript 4	October 25, 1991
Transcript 5	November 5, 1991
Transcript 6	November 19, 1991
Transcript 7	December 2, 1991
Transcript 8	January 13, 1992
Transcript 9	January 23, 1992
Transcript 10	February 11, 1992
Transcript 11	March 4, 1992
Transcript 12	March 17, 1992
Transcript 13	March 31, 1992
Transcript 14	June 30, 1992
Transcript 15	September 12, 1992
Transcript 16	September 30, 1992
Transcript 17	November 2, 1992
Transcript 18	November 14, 1992
Transcript 19	December 16, 1992

Appendix C

Following is an exerpt from the interpretive field text I constructed from the transcripts and then returned to Zach for his response.

Chapter Two (mid-November to Mid-December)

During Chapter Two you spent 4 weeks doing your practicum placement in a junior high school teaching French. At this time you would finally get to put your ideas into practice. In this chapter I have selected to tell the following five stories that I feel represent your experience during this time. I have named these stories Making it Happen, The Bubble Breaking, I Have to Prove Myself, Finding the Balance, and Making it Rain.

Making it Happen

I felt that you were really excited about beginning your practicum. After your initial meeting with Pat, you told me that you felt comfortable and were looking forward to putting your beliefs into practice. You explained that you were pleased with the freedom that your cooperating teacher had given you.

> *It's working out really well. I'm very very satisfied with my placement. Pat is excellent. She does everything. She's giving me enough space to keep me happy, but she's not letting me go to make me scared. She's somehow found that balance. (Z11.1)*

In order to make things happen, you needed to have a clear sense of what you wanted to happen. During your first week you were overwhelmed. Perhaps your initial unspoken question was What's happening? as you tried to make sense of the junior high six-day schedule that was divided into numerous 45-minute periods each bringing in a new wave of unfamiliar faces.

> *So it's kind of mind boggling. Ok, what's going on here. It's this class and she's saying this and then this. It's all making sense to me now but exactly like you're getting it right now is the way I got it when I walked in on Monday and I was sitting there, Oh God, and it was overload. I couldn't keep everything straight but now things are starting to fall into paths and I'm starting to see it. I'm starting to see how she's got all her books organized so I can find things fast, right. Even like recording marks, I don't want to take 10 minutes to try and record marks in class because first I've got to find it. If I know where it is, zip, I'm there. (Z11.6)*

You initially found there was so much to think about. As you began to understand what was happening you described your practicum as 'getting easier'.

> *As I get more comfortable it's getting easier. The work is not getting any less, but it's becoming more rote memory, you're just doing it, making it happen. I have to think too much right now, but it'll become easier, so it won't take quite as long or it won't be quite as mind boggling or draining. (Z11.5)*

You told me that since you now felt confident that you had enough subject area knowledge, you felt competent to do the job of teaching French to your students. I think you imagined your role as one of presenting students with the information they needed to know, structuring activities that would enable students to practise what you had taught them, and then allowing them to be accountable for their own learning by doing the assignments in ways that worked for them.

You began to appreciate the value of being well planned, something that B had stressed as important.

> *I'm tired. It was my own stupidity It was my lapse. This weekend. I had a lot of other things going and I decided Ah, I'm going to have some time to myself, right and I thought yesterday, Well, gee, you know, about 5 o'clock, sit down, throw a couple of lesson plans together. I have to teach a few classes tomorrow. I thought I knew where I was going. But when I sat down, and started doing it, I realized how much more had to go into it. I was up until 2 o'clock this morning. But I wasn't going to go to bed until I knew what I was doing because I wasn't going to try and fake my way through it. You can't do that. Well, you can, but it sure helps if you don't have to. (Z11.13)*

You needed to know when things would happen as you grappled with figuring out when you would see the various classes of 7s, 8s, and 9s that you would be responsible for teaching. You initially focused your attention on the monthly timetable schedule that would help you figure out when things would happen.

> *And what I'm also finding, ok, I have to cross that one out, I never had time today, this happened, cross that one out, but I can throw that one into the next class. I know where I stand. I know what I've done. I know what I haven't done and when you have 3 classes, different sections, all doing the same stuff, they're all going to proceed at slightly different rates. You have to know where you are because all of a sudden, did you guys do this, or didn't you, you know. You have to make meticulous notes. So, my notetaking is getting better, I don't know, I have a lesson plan here somewhere. This is not a lesson plan, this is a long range view. I took and photocopied hers just, starting last week I went and I had to take, I took this all on Friday. I wanted to see where the students were and what they*

had done and it gets a little more into, I put a lot more into it as we go on. (Z11.14)

You began to plan isolated lessons for the various 45-minute instructional blocks. You began by planning separate lessons for each class but soon saw this as a waste of time. For example, when you would write a lesson for a particular class, if you did not finish your agenda, you would end up rewriting things on the next period's lesson plan. You also felt that each class needed to move at the same pace, but found this did not happen. You began to notice 'massive differences' in the classes.

Massive differences. The 86s, they were, I can't remember (leafs through plan book). When I become a teacher I get one of those fancy books so I don't have to try and sort through this (laugh). I get one so I can keep track of what's going on. Today's Monday, 8Bs, they zipped through it, yeah. I expected them to do fairly well. The 86s are, of the 3 8s, they are my lowest class and they had some trouble with it today. (Z13.1)

You then began to devise a system for keeping track of what had happened in each class in order to be able to start where you left off with that particular class.

I'm looking forward to tomorrow. I still have to sit down and write up, I started writing up a lesson plan for the one class. The other class I just have to make a revised lesson plan because it is the same a some of the ones I taught today except for a few minor changes. And that's the thing. I'm constantly changing. But what I've decided to do is write a new lesson plan for each one just to have it on record. (Z11.8)

Once you had your plans on paper, they gave you a sense of security. You described how your plans reminded you of what you should be doing.

For a second today, I was sitting there, I had my lesson plan all written up, and I had just put it down and we were doing something , and then it was time to introduce a new concept and, Where's my lesson plan? (laugh). I'm sitting there, Hang on guys. I have to find this piece of paper. And Oh, gee, I can't find it. And I guess I have to fake my way through it. I knew what I was teaching and they said Ohhhh and they were laughing at me and that. And then I said, I just saw it out of the corner of my eye, and I found it. You guys don't get off that easy (laugh). But for a second I'd lost it. And they were just like, it was like I knew what I was teaching but I had it on paper. As soon as I didn't have that paper, suddenly I didn't have that security any more. It gives me a sense of security in knowing that, even though I wrote it, it doesn't matter. It's written down. This is the way it's supposed to be. Suddenly, you know what you'e doing and things can't knock you off. And that's what I'm finding. If it's written down, you will not sway off topic too far. You will get to your goal. Your goal being your objectives. You want this and this done according to this method. And, yes, ok, we're going to change it here and here because this happens and

> *this happens. But you at least know where you're heading. You don't just walk in and say Well, I think I'll do this today and then suddenly you'll end up off on another topic and then you won't get where you want to go in the first place. I'm seeing the value in having some clear objectives. Knowing what you want to get done that day. (Z11.13)*

You described how when something unexpected happened, you felt more comfortable dealing with it when you had your written plan to pull you back on course.

> *It made the things move smoothly today. Things were going the way I wanted them to go. Yes, there were minor problems here or there, but they were minor. Like they don't bother you when you know where you're going. You just quickly make a U turn around it and keep going so I'm happy I did all this. I can see myself doing this in the future, making big long lesson plans because it's so much easier. Mind you, I shouldn't say that in the future. Pat's been teaching for 5 years now and she says she's got it all in her head. She's done this a couple of times. Well, this is her third round at this and she's starting to know (Z11.9)*

I think you soon found that being well prepared and having a sense of what you wanted to happen was not enough. You had told me in Chapter One that you were not concerned about the actual teaching. You said you felt confident that if you knew enough about what you were going to teach, the actual teaching would fall into place. You described how that could not be planned ahead of time, but rather you would need to read the situation and deal with it as it happened.

APPENDIX D

Following is an exerpt from the interpretive field text I constructed from the conversations I had with Susan during the Fall term. These were given to Susan for her response.

I have tried to make some sense of your Fall Term at university which at one point you described to me as a "bowl of soup and I am digging for the alphabet letters." I have selected and named eight themes as I have tried to pull some order out of what you described as a very confusing term. The themes I have chosen to write about are: The Interview, The Alien, Lists and Webs, Connecting With People, Making Choices, Mixed Messages, Half a Story, and Evaluation. I will be very interested in your response to these selections. I hope I have been able to capture some of the ways you were experiencing your program through the Fall Term.

These selections are in no particular order. I think this also reflects your experience. When I described to you on the phone how Zach's stories seemed to have a logical sequence while yours seems to lack movement, you replied, "Maybe that's because he was progressing."

The Interview

You began your Environmental Studies course with a sense of lacking both experience and knowledge in environmental issues. Your first assignment compounded your sense of not knowing when you found out it involved interviewing a teacher or a child - something else you did not know how to do.

> *The first thing the professor asked us is to write down what we know, like what we took in elementary about environmental studies - Nothing! Zero. Zip, zilch (laugh). (S1.1)*

You described your experiences in elementary school in the following way:

> *It was just don't litter and today we're going to pick up the litter and everyone groaned (laugh), you know. That was it. And nature walks, appreciate nature, but it never told you how to preserve it. Don't pick the flowers. Well, when you have chemicals killing your flowers, it doesn't really matter (laugh). (S1.2)*

When you were asked what courses you had taken in university that related to environmental issues, you were able to list a few

> *I took a few, like my Political Science course related to it, a few Economics, my Geography. I have an assignment due in a month which involves an interview with a small child or a teacher K to 6 (laugh). A taped interview! Ohhh.. (S1.1)*

This assignment left you with an overwhelming sense of not knowing what to do. You knew little about environmental issues and less about interviewing although you did know that interviewing required certain skills of which you were unaware. You also had no idea where you could find a teacher or child to interview.

> *I'm panicking. I don't know what I do with it. I wouldn't even know how to interview someone, especially a child. So there's all this reserve reading the professor gave us to help us but it's, we were told it should be done this week. The interviewing part. I don't even have a clue where I'm going to find someone never mind... All these people "Oh, I can do that with the people I work with." Good for you Do you have any extras? So, I don't know where.. (S1.1)*

You also needed to decide whether to interview an adult or a child.

> *I can't even decide if I want to interview kids or if I want to interview an adult because I wouldn't have the skills to interview a child.... And if you're interviewing kids the professor's going to mark you on that skill. Although I would like to...Here we come back to the marks eh, the practicality. I could always switch your tape recorder on you (laugh). (S1.1)*

I agreed that you could interview me as a teacher, adding that I too knew very little about environmental issues. When I mentioned that I thought "It would be neat to do a child," you replied

> *It would be but I think it would be such a .....I mean in one respect I thought whose point of view would I want more at this point in time and I think I would want the teacher's point of view more. Where the system is in this subject.... And with the child too you have to wonder, you're not getting only teaching, you're getting home. Like are my parents environmentally conscious or not. So, bang, my first assignment sucks. I was just talking to Chris today saying how I really had no worries so far.(S1.3/4)*

You also worried that a child might ask you questions which you would be unable to answer.

> *The professor wanted us to ask them what they know about the environment, ask them if they had any topics discussed [refers to assignment sheet] Collect some simple concrete materials, so pictures, photographs - that would be with the child. Have the child handle, like these articles, and try and find out their ideas and explanations about the*

> *topic. What influenced the child to have these ideas, the questions the child still has about this topic. Now I'm not an expert on environmental stuff so, is this child going to be looking to me for answers cause he's going to walk away very confused. I don't have any environmental background at all. We didn't do that when I went to school. (S1.2)*

You not only needed to choose between an adult and a child, you also needed to focus on a topic. As you began to imagine what would be involved in actually doing the assignment, your mind filled with questions and concerns.

> *Pollution's pretty broad. You have to choose your own topic too and I don't even know where to start with that. I just sort of felt like for an education course, the professor didn't deliver the lesson very well because I was very confused at the end and I asked about 100 questions. Can we use microcassettes? Cause you have to hand in your audio. Can we use, what types of pictures, where shall we get this material, do we have to have this material approved? I mean are you going to walk in to this young child and scar them for life with one picture? This is what your back yard will look like in ten years if we don't get a landfill site. Or else interview the teacher. Find out how they describe or define environmental education, what type of teaching have they done with this, challenges to teaching this subject, professional support and training for this subject, perceived priority of environmental education and concerns. And then you have to hand in the tape with a title page, a neatly written seven page double spaced paper with an introduction, discussion, reflection on your interview and implications for teaching. I mean it seems pretty straight forward on here, but when I go to interview someone it's going to seem like what am I doing. It seems like a lot of work (laugh). (S1.2/3)*

You decided you would interview me. I thought this might alleviate some of your concerns and said any time you wanted to do the interview was fine with me. However, you still had to think your way through several issues before we actually did the interview three weeks later. When we met for our second taped conversation, I asked you "Are you feeling better about the interview now?" You replied

> *Yeah. I feel better about it now. When I really sat down and looked at it and did a bit of reading. I also asked the professor today if, when I'm interviewing my teacher, do I interview in a general sense or should I narrow it down to pollution etc. My professor said "No, for an adult it would probably be best to approach it in a general way and then if they have something specific, take that into account." So that kind of made it a little clearer to me. (S2.11)*

However, you were still struggling with the purpose of the assignment and how it would help you in learning to teach Environmental Studies.

> *Well the objective was never really clearly stated. Find out, somewhere in the system, teacher/student, find out what they know about it, what they've*

done with it, where they think it's going, what are the problems with it. Then reflect on that and write an implications section. It's supposed to... help you... I don't know. Set priorities or sort of decide where your priorities are. But then I'll hand it in and that will be the end. Did you discuss your priorities? No. We discussed why it was important, what attitudes, beliefs, and values had come out. Why we're in the mess we are today and how to change it or is there any point sort of thing... I just feel like I know I'm going to learn all about environmental education, how to integrate it into my subjects, and I'm going to get out in school and figure out that I have so much to do just getting my act together and getting my class together - that's just going to slip to the side. (S2.11/12)

You imagined a very different type of preparation as beneficial.

I'm taking one person's interview and I'm supposed to formulate my stand on this. I don't agree with that. I'd like to hear different people's views and find out what works in the class, what didn't work for them. Why they would never do it again, or why they would try it differently. That for me would be beneficial. And I don't feel that that, I don't feel that that would be any more disjointed than the way I'm doing it now. Granted, I'd be doing a lot of running around, and maybe a lot of imposing into different classrooms, but at least I would be in the environment that I will be in when I'm finished and learn how to deal with it in that framework. This is all artificial. Completely artificial. There's nothing in here that is true to the real classroom except that we're all students but at this level we're all responsible for our marks, we're responsible for attending class. It's not even the same ball game. I feel like the environment is so artificial. Even if you could get in with four or five teachers and stick with them for a month, and have these lectures on activities, ideas. How to present them, how to put them into a developmental thing. Then you'd go in there with some ammunition. (S2.12)